

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEASIS



For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ROLE ORIENTATIONS OF SOCIAL WELFARE WORKERS:

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by



LYLIAN EVELYN KLIMEK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER, 1968

THESIS
1968 (F)
117

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance a thesis entitled "Role Orientations of Social Welfare Workers: An Exploratory Study" submitted by Lylian Evelyn Klimek in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with the occupational socialization of social workers who are employed in a public welfare organization. Specifically, the study explores the conditions and processes which underlie the development of role orientations among members of this profession. Two polar types of role orientation are under study: The professional and the bureaucratic orientations.

Assuming that a person may be classified as "high" or "low" on each of these types of role orientation, four combinations are possible.

The implications of three dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship; authority, affectivity, and socialization content transmitted, for the development of role orientation are explored. Also, the study seeks to explore the implications of certain background characteristics and experiences for the development of role orientation.

The data used in the study were collected from thirty practitioners and six supervisors in two regional offices of a public welfare agency over a period extending from February to June 1968. An interview schedule and a questionnaire were used to obtain data. The collection and analysis of data was carried on concurrently.

When the distribution of scores on scales designed to measure professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation was divided at the midpoint it was found that the subjects exhibited four types of role orientation. Using the variables of age, sex, education,

and career pattern, profiles were established for employees holding different role orientations.

Examination of data on the superordinate-subordinate relationship provided by subordinates led to the construction of a typology of supervisory approaches or ways of exercising authority. The approaches were labeled as the bureaucratic, laissez-faire, and educative approaches. Data obtained from six supervisors and the agreement between the accounts of subjects describing the same supervisor were used to provide validation for the bureaucratic and educative approaches.

Subjects who, during the first few years of practice, were subordinate to supervisors classified as "educative" tend to display a high professional orientation, whereas those working under the "bureaucratic" or "laissez-faire" supervisors tend to exhibit a low professional orientation.

As compared to the "bureaucratic" and "laissez-faire" supervisors, those who adopt an "educative" approach make greater efforts to socialize subordinates into the occupational role. The educative supervisor who emphasizes coaching and sanctioning of subordinates facilitates the development of professional orientation by fostering the development of identification with the occupational role and by fostering the development of attachment to himself.

Socialization also takes place through informal processes, outside the specified roles. There is evidence that the socializing efforts of peers reinforce the efforts of the educative supervisor, thereby creating a climate favorable to the development of identification

with the occupational role and with the professional group. Conversely, when the supervisor adopts a "bureaucratic" or "laissez-faire" approach toward subordinates, socialization takes place primarily through informal processes. Not only do peers become important sources of socialization, they also encourage each other to resist the socializing aims of the supervisor by undermining or avoiding his efforts to exert influence. The findings suggest that these conditions do not promote the development of important professional identifications and commitments.

For these subjects it is likely that bureaucratic orientation was acquired prior to entry into the social work field. However, there is evidence which suggests that certain supervisors may "interfere" with the development of bureaucratic orientation by lessening the subordinate's need to rely on organizational policies and rules.

Variations in professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation can not be explained solely with reference to intra-organizational experiences with others occurring during the first years of practice. However, when the background characteristics, previous experiences, and intra-organizational experiences of subjects are considered jointly, it is not possible to determine the extent to which differences in supervisory approaches and peer relationships have contributed to variations in role orientation.

It is proposed that the implications of supervisory approaches and peer relationships for the development of role orientation are conditional upon factors such as age, sex, education, previous occupational experience, and seniority.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful for the time and assistance given by those who co-operated with the study.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. B. Abu-Laban for his guidance and advice throughout the project.

Thanks are also extended to Dr. C. Meilicke and Dr. R. Schneck for their assistance and critical commentary on the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS RELATED LITERATURE	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	1
Role Orientations	3
Adult Socialization	6
Summary.	15
II. METHODOLOGY	22
Introduction	22
The Group Studied	23
Data Collection	26
Analyses of Data	39
III. THE CAREERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS. . .	46
Introduction	46
Career Patterns	47
Background Characteristics Related to Role Orientations of Subjects	54
Implications for the Study	56
IV. THE SUPERORDINATE-SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIP	60
Construction of the Typology	61
Supervisory Approaches	62
Supervisory Approaches: Discussion	70
The Processes: Coaching and Sanctioning	75

	PAGE
Implications of Supervisory Approaches for Professional Orientation	82
The First Years of Practice	87
Summary	89
V. PEER RELATIONSHIPS	94
Supervisors and Peers as Socializing Agents	97
Other Conditions Bearing on Socializing Efforts	103
Summary	108
VI. ROLE ORIENTATION	110
Introduction	110
The Development of Bureaucratic Orientation	110
Background Characteristics and Organizational Experience Related to Role Orientation	116
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	124
Discussion of Findings	125
Validity of the Findings	129
BIBLIOGRAPHY	134
APPENDIX A -- Construction of the Scales: the Second Pre-test	138
APPENDIX B -- The Interview Schedule	143
APPENDIX C -- Questionnaire	145
APPENDIX D -- Role Orientation, Selected Background Characteristics, and Supervisor's Approach for Each Subject	152
APPENDIX E -- Determination of High Scorers and Low Scorers for each Scale	154
APPENDIX F -- The Deviant Cases	155

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
CHAPTER III	
1 Career Patterns by Selected Background Characteristics . .	47
2 Role Orientations by Career Patterns and Selected Background Characteristics	55
CHAPTER IV	
3 Respondents' Perceptions of Supervisory Behavior	75
4 Perceived Supervisory Approach and Respondents' Role Orientations	83
5 Behavior Attributed to Three Supervisory Approaches. . . .	83
6 Changes Attributed to Three Supervisory Approaches	84
CHAPTER V	
7 Respondents' Perception of Co-worker Behavior	94
8 Role Orientation by Perceived Supervisory Approach and Socializers	105
CHAPTER VI	
9 Role Orientations by Selected Background Characteristics and Perceived Supervisory Approach	117

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter states the problem of the study and the general theoretical perspective which underlies the problem.

The present study is exploratory, in an attempt to investigate the conditions and processes which underlie the development of role orientations among members of the social work profession.

The concept of role orientation and types of role orientations derived from empirical work are examined first. Then the literature in the area of adult socialization is examined with particular reference to the ideational component of socialization into an occupational role. Finally, the implications for this study to be drawn from the literature are summarized.

THE PROBLEM

This study is concerned with the socialization of social workers within the context of a public welfare organization. More specifically, the study addresses itself to the conditions and processes which underlie the development of role orientations among members of this profession.

The term, role orientation, as it is used here, centers on the distinction between commitment to the profession and commitment to the employing organization. Professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation can be held simultaneously and in varying degrees by any one individual.¹

The development of role orientation takes place primarily during the course of the career as it is worked out within the institutions and organizations of the occupation. An essential function of occupational socialization, in addition to imparting skills and knowledge, is the inculcation of commitment to professional standards and principles.² Likewise, employing organizations attempt to inculcate in the employee commitment to their goals.³

In order to determine the processes and conditions which underlie the acquisition of role orientations, the study focuses on the direct interchange between the employee and those members of his role-set who act as socializing agents. This study seeks to explore the implications of three dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship for the development of role orientations. These are: (a) the formality of the relationship, (b) authority and affectivity in the relationship, and (c) the socialization content transmitted.

Also, the present study attempts to explore the implications of certain background characteristics and conditions surrounding entry into the occupation, particularly the subjective elements involved in career choice, for the development of role orientations. Factors such

as age, sex, education, and previous occupational experience are relevant here. A third focus of the study concerns the development of scales to measure role orientation.

ROLE ORIENTATIONS

The literature on role orientations is examined here. The discussion centers on the definition of the term and on the types of role orientations derived from empirical work.

1. The Concept

Although the concept of role orientation appears to have a core of shared meaning there is no explicit nominal definition or operationally clear definition of the term.⁵ Its meaning can perhaps be clarified by relating it to and distinguishing it from other aspects of the social role.

Role orientation is one analytically distinct aspect of the social role.⁶ It refers to the social psychological aspect of social role. The social role viewed as an aspect of the person is distinct from social role viewed as the structurally defined requirements associated with a given position and from social role viewed as a pattern of role performance.

Of major importance in the taking on of an occupational role is the acquisition of a role orientation which creates transformations in commitments, values, and beliefs. The term encompasses the individual's adaptation, at the ideational level, within the occupational structure. It refers to the individual's conception

of the part he is to play within the occupational structure. "It is his inner definition of what someone in his position is supposed to think and do about it."⁷ The role orientation which the individual develops represents his attempts to structure his work life and to define his place within the occupational system.

Role orientation, as it is used in the analysis of occupational roles, centers on the distinction between professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation treated as ideal types.⁸ As ideal conceptions, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation provide competing sources of loyalty and guidelines for action.⁹

The professionally oriented employee exhibits allegiance to professional goals and standards, works for the approval of the professional group of colleagues, and displays a concomitant lack of loyalty to the employing organization and its goals. The bureaucratically oriented employee manifests a lesser commitment to the profession, working for the goals and the approval of the organization.¹⁰

The two ideal conceptions can be understood with reference to the emergence of new institutional patterns and particularly in the light of strains created by the merger of the two institutional forms, the professional and the bureaucratic forms of occupational life.¹¹ The ideal conceptions of role are related to and reflect this major change in the occupational structure of western society. That is, professionals have increasingly become salaried employees of bureaucratic organizations and complex organizations have become subject

to the influence of professionalism. While professional principles share elements with those which govern bureaucratic practice, others are divergent and have tended to engender strains between professionals and their employing organizations.¹²

Of course, these ideal types do not exist in pure form, nor are the characteristics embodied in the notion of professional and bureaucratic necessarily mutually exclusive and contradictory.

2. Types of Role Orientations

To the extent that professional and bureaucratic standards and principles are merged within a given organization, the evidence suggests that employees combine elements of both in varying degrees and can be categorized in terms of their relative adherence to both, considered jointly.¹³

The attempts of authors to grasp the range of individual variation from which empirically derived types could be constructed have yielded four types of role orientations for professionals working in different organizational contexts.¹⁴ All typologies derived from empirical work make or imply a distinction between the professionally oriented and the bureaucratically oriented employee.

Kornhauser¹⁵ has constructed a typology which summarizes the types of role orientations established by research according to the distinction these make between the professional and the bureaucratic orientation. In his words, "The professional employee may be oriented toward the profession in which he has been trained, the organization for which he works, both the profession and the organization, or

neither of them."¹⁶ This statement describes and summarizes the variations in role orientations as combinations of the polar types, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation.

Kornhauser: Typology of Role Orientations

I	II	III	IV
P O	P O	P O	P O
+ -	- +	+ +	- -

Type I combines a high professional orientation with a low bureaucratic orientation. (HP-LB) The reverse combination is exhibited by Type II. (LP-HB) Type III represents a high degree of acceptance of both professional and organizational principles. (HP-HB) Type IV combines a low professional orientation with a low bureaucratic orientation. (LP-LB)

For the purpose of the study, two Likert-type scales were constructed and used to measure, respectively, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation. Respondents were assigned to one of the four types established by Kornhauser on the basis of their degree of adherence to principles implied in each scale.

ADULT SOCIALIZATION

Although authors have not specifically investigated the processes and conditions which underlie the development of role orientations, the literature in this area suggests sets of factors bearing on the problem of how employees come to hold one or another role orientation. The following discussion examines: the concept

of socialization, the central roles in the socialization structure, the dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship, and the receptivity of the socializee to socializing attempts.

1. The Concept

Adult socialization has only recently emerged as a major area of sociological inquiry.¹⁷ In the approach of authors working in this area, socialization refers to the learning of social roles. The term designates "the processes by which individuals selectively acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, values, and motives current in the groups of which they are or will become members."¹⁸

While the acquisition of social roles is not viewed as the entire content of socialization it is commonly held to be the most important aspect of adult socialization.¹⁹

The trend toward greater concern with the processes of adult socialization is particularly evident in the recent attention given to the processes of socialization into an occupational role. Merton states that "Socialization refers to the learning of social roles. In its application to the medical student socialization refers to the process through which he develops his professional self with its characteristic values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills, fusing these into a more or less consistent set of dispositions which govern his behavior in a wide variety of professional situations."²⁰

Merton's definition and those of Simpson,²¹ and of Becker and Carper²² underline the importance of major value changes and altered personal conceptions which accompany socialization into adult

social statuses. Adult socialization, as it refers to the learning of an occupational role, is seen as a process in which the individual modifies his self-concept through the acquisition of values, commitments, attitudes and personality characteristics vis a vis contact with significant others.

In other words, the problem of socialization is viewed not only as one of how individuals acquire technical skills and knowledge but also as one of how they acquire the ideational components of the social role.

Studies which demonstrate the major value changes and altered personal conceptions which accompany socialization to occupational roles are based on the premise that the twin objectives of socialization into an occupational role are to inculcate both ideational and behavioral components.²³

Although the outcomes of socialization into an occupational role are stated as behavioral conformity and commitment to "appropriate" values and attitudes, socialization is viewed as characterized by a holistic intent and outcome.²⁴ The major outcome of socialization is the holistic acquisition of a status-role rather than of a specific norms, values, skills, or commitments. "It is the integration of these elements in a role, rather than specific norms, values, habits, etc., that is conveyed in socialization."²⁵ That is, authors seeking to identify the processes and conditions involved in the process of occupational socialization have tended to concentrate on the status-role as an organized entity rather than upon specific outcomes such as

that of role orientation.

2. The Central Roles in the Socialization Setting

Studies of socialization into occupational roles direct attention to the central roles in the socialization structure, the role of socializer and of socializee. In Merton's words, "Socialization takes place primarily through social interaction with people who are significant for the individual, in the medical school, probably with faculty members above all others."²⁶ Further, "the process of role acquisition involves both direct learning and indirect learning in which values and attitudes are acquired as a by-product of interaction with significant others."²⁷

The evidence suggests that it is through work-related social relationships that the ideational components of social role are inculcated. A number of studies indicate that the socializee learns behavior, and more important, the values and beliefs appropriate to his position through interaction with significant others who hold beliefs about what his behavior and attitudes should be and who reward or punish him for his actions.²⁸

The recruit's work-related social relationships and experiences with others in the role-set who act as socializing agents is selected as one set of factors which is of importance in the acquisition of ideational elements of the occupational role. Dimensions of the relationship with various others are discussed in the following section.

3. Dimensions of the Socializer-Socializee Relationship

Existing research suggests at least three dimensions of the recruit's relationships with socializing agent(s): (1) formality of the relationship, (2) authority and affectivity in the relationship, and (3) the socialization content transmitted.²⁹ Each of these will be discussed in turn.

(1) According to Brim's classification³⁰ the role of learner or socializee within a formal organization may be specified or unspecified. That is, the recruit may or may not be required to take the formal role of learner in relation to an organizationally designated socializing agent who is expected to train, educate, or in some way change the recruit.

When the direct interchange between the formally designated socializing agent and the socializee is considered socialization takes place within the apprenticeship relationship.³¹ Particularly within organizations in which recruits are "in-service" trained, the attempt of organizations to socialize recruits takes the form of apprenticeship instruction by formally designated socializing agents.

The apprenticeship relationship appears to be central for the acquisition of the ideational components of occupational roles.³² Such learning situations are conducive to the development of interpersonal relations between the recruit and the socializing agent. They foster identification with the socializing agent and internalization of his values.

Studies have made it clear that even within formal organizations which assign the recruit to a formally designated socializing agent much socialization still occurs through informal processes, outside the specified roles.³³ Other members of the role-set may play an important part in the recruit's training and adaptation. Socialization may be, within limits, informally structured by the peer group, by individual peers, or by the recruits themselves.³⁴

(2) A second dimension of the relationship between the recruit and the socializing agent(s) is that of authority and affectivity. This aspect is clearly related to the first dimension. As a recognized representative of the organization in which the training function is being carried out the formally designated socializing agent possesses authority which the recruit is expected to acknowledge and to subject himself to in work-related matters. Within organizations which train recruits on the job the formally designated socializing agent is usually the employee's superordinate in the organizational hierarchy.

The fundamental role of the superordinate in the organizational hierarchy is command and review. Supervision, in professional social work culture, is conceived of in terms of education rather than command.³⁵ Supervision is a key element in the training of social workers within the professional school and the teacher-trainee pattern tends to be carried over into general practice.

There is evidence that welfare organizations have taken over this feature of professional social work culture and defined the responsibilities of the supervisor in terms of standards derived from the professional culture.³⁶ As such, the way in which authority is exercised is a result of the interplay between the organization's needs for hierarchic control and the professional conception of supervision as primarily educative.³⁷

It is expected that certain supervisors may tend to stress the hierarchic aspects of the relationship whereas others may emphasize the teaching and supportive aspects of their role in relation to the recruit. Differences in emphasis by superordinates may operate to establish relationships between themselves and their subordinates which are more or less conducive to the exercise of influence.³⁸

Individual peers or the peer group may aid the socialization process by taking part in the training of the recruit and by assisting him to adapt to the setting and to the work.³⁹ Differences in the extent to which peers facilitate the recruit's adaptation to the setting and to the occupation may be more or less conducive to the inculcation of "appropriate" commitments and behaviors.

(3) A third dimension of the relationship concerns the socialization content which socializing agents attempt to transmit and the nature of efforts to change the recruit.

It has been noted that the purposes of socialization are to give the individual knowledge, ability, and motivation with respect

to the ideational and behavioral components of the role.⁴⁰

Ideally, formally designated socializing agents are expected to be concerned with inculcating values and motives as well as with transmitting knowledge and skills required for role performance. Likewise, they are expected to have the knowledge and skills required to complete the training of the recruit in the manner required by the goals of the organization.⁴¹ They are expected to serve as role models representing the goal toward which the recruit is moving.

Socializing agents who are designated by the organization to train the recruit might differ as to whether their primary concern is the transmission of skills and knowledge or whether they should also attempt to influence or re-shape the recruit's values and motives. They might exhibit variation in their ability or willingness to transmit different contents.⁴²

Under certain conditions the recruit may learn as much from peers who can aid his adaptation as he does from formally designated agents.⁴³ Individual peers or the peer group may aid the socialization process as directed by the formal agent intensifying the effects of his socializing attempts.⁴⁴ For example, peers may aid the efforts and aims of formally designated socializing agents by exerting pressure on the recruit to adopt values and behaviors sanctioned by these individuals.

Conversely, the peer group contains a potential for developing counter norms which oppose or undermine the efforts and

aims of formally designated socializing agents.⁴⁵ Peers may encourage or support individual resistance to the efforts of formally designated agents to change his values and behavior.

In summary: These dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship are selected for the purpose of exploring the direct interchange between the recruit and others in the role-set who act as his socializing agents. The objective is to uncover what goes on between the recruit and socializing agent(s) and how this relates to the development of role orientations.

4. Receptivity to Socializing Attempts

The apprenticeship relationship and the direct interchange between the formally designated socializing agent and the recruit represent the attempts of the organization to socialize recruits. Socialization into an occupational role can not be understood without some knowledge of differences in the starting points of recruits which may make them selectively receptive to the efforts of formal agents to change them.⁴⁶

The receptiveness of recruits is related to organizational selection procedures.⁴⁷ Selection procedures can be devised to ensure that those who enter the organization have appropriate motives and values for the anticipated role and will be receptive to socializing influences. Organizations which do not employ rigorous selection procedures will recruit individuals who vary in motivation and ability to perform the occupational role.⁴⁸ Particularly for organizations such as public welfare agencies which do not employ

rigorous selection procedures to screen applicants it is necessary that socialization processes be linked to antecedent conditions and characteristics.

Characteristics such as age, sex, formal education, training, and the subjective set of elements involved in career choice have been suggested as factors which make for differences in receptivity to socializing efforts.⁴⁹

This study seeks to investigate the implications of these background factors and of conditions surrounding entry into the occupation for the development of role orientations.

SUMMARY

This study proposes to explore the conditions and processes which underlie the development of role orientations among members of the social work profession who are employed by a public welfare agency.

A review of the literature in the area of role orientations reveals that studies have attempted to grasp the range of individual variation and to establish types of role orientations exhibited by employees working in different organizational contexts. Kornhauser has constructed a typology which summarizes the empirically derived variations in role orientation as combinations of the polar types, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation.

In this study respondents were assigned to one of the four types established by Kornhauser on the basis of their degree of

acceptance of principles implied in scales which were constructed and used to measure, respectively, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation.

In spite of the recent attention to processes of occupational socialization, particularly to ideational changes which accompany socialization to occupational roles, the processes and conditions underlying the development of role orientations remain largely unexplored.

An examination of literature in the area of adult socialization indicates that authors have concentrated on the status-role as an organized entity rather than upon specific outcomes of the socialization process such as that of role orientation. That is, they have been concerned with identifying and describing the processes which underlie the acquisition of the status-role.

A review of the literature in this area directed attention to the interchange between the recruit and those members of the role-set who act as socializing agents as a fruitful avenue of investigation. Studies have demonstrated the importance of work-related relationships and experiences with significant others for the acquisition of ideational elements such as values, commitments, and attitudes. Existing work suggests the relevance of three dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship: (1) formality of the relationship, (2) authority and affectivity in the relationship, and (3) the socialization content transmitted. These dimensions were selected in order to explore the interchange between the recruit and those

others who act as his agents of socialization.

The literature indicates that recruit responses to organizational attempts to change them differ and directs attention to conditions and characteristics which influence receptivity to socializing attempts. This study investigates the implications of age, sex, formal education, and previous occupational experience for the problem. Conditions surrounding entry into the occupation particularly the subjective elements involved in career choice, are also explored.

The lack of theoretical and empirical attention to the problem of how employees come to hold one or another role orientation is unfortunate. It is possible that by such exploration a better understanding of the processes of occupational socialization and of the concept of role orientation might be gained.

It is hoped that the study will clarify the following questions: What occurs in the on-going relationship between the recruit and various others who act as socializing agents? What conditions and qualities of relationships with various others foster receptivity to socializing efforts? How are these processes and conditions related to the acquisition of role orientation?

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER I

- ¹See Corwin R., "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, 56, 1960-61, 604.
- ²Merton R., Kendal P., and Reader G., The Student Physician, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957, 267.
- ³Whyte W.H., The Organization Man, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1956. Scott R., "Professionals in Bureaucracies: Areas of Conflict," in Professionalization, Vollmer H. and Mills D., editors, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc. 1966, 265.
- ⁴See Wilensky H. and Lebeaux C., Industrial Society and Social Welfare, New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1958.
- ⁵See Wilensky H., Intellectuals in Labor Unions: Organizational Pressures on Professional Roles, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956, Gouldner A., "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 1957-58, 281; and Corwin R., "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, 38, 1964, 310.
- ⁶Levinson D., "Role, Personality, and Social Structure," in Sociology: The Progress of a Decade, Lipset S. and Smelser N., editors, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1963, 299.
- ⁷Ibid, 302.
- ⁸Gouldner, op Cit.
- ⁹Corwin, op cit., 607.
- ¹⁰Gouldner, op cit., 290. Glaser B., Organizational Scientists: Their Professional Careers, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964, 15.
- ¹¹Blau P. and Scott R., Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962, 60-64; and Kornhauser W., "The Interdependence of Professions and Organizations," in Professionalization, Vollmer H. and Mills D., editors, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, 291.

- ¹²See Miller G., "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation among Industrial Scientists and Engineers," American Sociological Review, 32, 1967, 755; and Hall R., "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," American Sociological Review, 33, 1968, 92.
- ¹³Corwin, op cit.
- ¹⁴Wilensky H., op cit.; and Riessman L., "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, 27, 1949, 308.
- ¹⁵Kornhauser W., Scientists in Industry, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963, 117-155.
- ¹⁶Ibid, 117.
- ¹⁷Henceforth, the symbols provided here, i.e. HP-LB, are used to refer to a given role orientation.
- ¹⁸Merton, Kendall, and Reader, op cit.; and Sewell W., "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 349, 1963, 163.
- ¹⁹Sewell, op cit., 163.
- ²⁰Brim O., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," in Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays, Brim O. and Wheeler S., New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, 1.
- ²¹Merton, Kendall, and Reader, op cit., 287.
- ²²Simpson I., "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 47.
- ²³Becker H. and Carper J., "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, 51, 1956, 289.
- ²⁴Roscow I., "Forms and Functions of Adult Socialization," Social Forces 66, 1965, 44.
- ²⁵Sherlock B. and Morris R., "The Evolution of the Professional: A Paradigm," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 27.
- ²⁶Ibid, 32.

- ²⁷ Merton, Kendall, and Reader, op cit., 287.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Peace J., "Faculty Influence and Professional Participation," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 63; and Seeman M. and Evans J., "Apprenticeship and Attitude Change," American Journal of Sociology, 57, 1962, 365. For an opposing view regarding the inculcation of ideational components of occupational role, see Carlin J., Lawyers Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar, New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1966, 143-48.
- ³⁰ Brim, op cit.
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Sherlock and Morris, op cit.
- ³³ Merton, Kendall, and Reader, op cit.; and Becker and Carper, op. cit. Strauss A., "Coaching," in Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Biddle B. and Thomas E., editors, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, 350.
- ³⁴ Sherlock and Morris, op cit.; and Wheeler S., "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," in Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays, Brim O. and Wheeler S., New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, 56.
- ³⁵ Ibid. Becker H., Geer B., Hughes E., and Strauss A., Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- ³⁶ Wilensky and Lebeaux, op cit.; and Ohlin L. and Pivan H., "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2, 1956, 219.
- ³⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁸ Ibid. Blau and Scott, op cit.
- ³⁹ Lippit R. and White R., "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Readings in Social Psychology, Newcomb T., Maccoby E., and Hartley E., editors, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958, 496.

- ⁴⁰ Sherlock and Morris, op cit. Rosen R. and Bates A., "The Structure of Socialization in Graduate Schools," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 71.
- ⁴¹ Brim, op cit., 25.
- ⁴² Rosen and Bates, op cit.
- ⁴³ For opposing views, see Brim, op cit., 26-27; and Wright C. and Turk H., "Introductory Comments on the Socialization of Adults," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 3-7.
- ⁴⁴ Wheeler, op cit.; and Shils E., "Primary Groups in the Modern Army," in Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of the American Soldier, Merton R. and Lazarsfeld P., editors, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Becker H. and Geer B., "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, 23, 1958, 50; and Becker H. and Geer B., "Student Culture in Medical School," Harvard Education Review, 28, 1958, 70.
- ⁴⁷ Merton R., "Anticipatory Socialization," in Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Biddle B. and Thomas E., editors, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, 348; and Wright C., "Changes in the Occupational Commitment of Sociology Students," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 55.
- ⁴⁸ Sherlock and Morris, op cit.
- ⁴⁹ Wright, op cit.; and Sherlock and Morris, op cit.
- ⁵⁰ Miller, op cit.; and Wilensky and Lebeaux, op cit.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Data were collected from thirty social workers and six supervisors employed in two regional offices of a public welfare agency in Edmonton. An interview schedule and a questionnaire were constructed and used to obtain data from the subjects.

The interview schedule consisted of questions designed to secure information in the following areas: (1) conditions surrounding the subjects' entry into the occupation, (2) the subject's relationship and experiences with superordinates in the organizational hierarchy, and (3) his relationships and experiences with co-workers. In addition, respondents were asked about their present career plans and aspirations.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of questions used to obtain data on the subject's age, sex, education and training, seniority, work history, and role-behavior. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of two Likert-type scales which were used to measure role orientations.

The discussion in this chapter focuses on: (1) a description of the subjects and organizational context, (2) selection of the subjects, (3) construction of the interview schedule, (4) construction of the scales, (5) problems and strategies of data collection, and (6)

analysis of the data.

THE GROUP STUDIED

1. The Subjects and Organizational Setting

Thirty social workers employed in two regional offices were interviewed and completed the questionnaire. Six supervisors were interviewed in order to compare their accounts of the superordinate-subordinate relationship with those given by their subordinates.

The employees selected are part of a larger staff of professional employees who work in thirty regional offices located throughout the province.¹ Twenty-two social workers and four supervisors are employed in Office A which is the largest regional office having a professional staff of approximately ninety employees. This office is divided into the Child Welfare Department and the Public Assistance Department. Each in turn is divided into work units in which specific types of programs are administered.² The average work unit consists of a unit supervisor and eight social workers.

Staff in the child welfare units administer the various types of child welfare programs and provide counselling services to clients. Staff in each of the four public assistance units are responsible for the administration of one category of financial services to clients.

Eight social workers and two supervisors were selected from Office B. This office is divided into four work units each headed by a unit supervisor who is responsible for approximately seven subordinates.

All social workers in Office B perform similar types of tasks because caseloads are diversified. The diversified approach requires that a practitioner provide both child welfare and public assistance services to clients on his caseload. This approach is an alternative to the specialized form of task organization which characterizes Office A.

Professional employees in both regional offices are subordinated to an administrative framework.³ Most aspects of the tasks they perform are controlled by an elaborate set of operating rules. However, the organization has adopted certain professional principles and standards. For example, it has taken over the professional conception of supervision as primarily educative. The responsibility for the "in-service" training of recruits is assigned to the unit supervisor.⁴ It seems likely that the professional definition of supervision has been adopted as a means of coping with recruits who lack professional preparation⁵ and as a means of extending the supervisor's authority over his subordinates.

2. Selection of Subjects

One criterion used in selection of the group studied was the writer's familiarity with the organization and its practitioners gained through a period of employment. Knowledge of the group and the organizational setting facilitated this study in a number of ways.⁶

The thirty social workers were selected in the following way. For each office a staff list was obtained from the regional

office administrator. The administrator of Office A was asked to supply information on the age, education and experience of each employee. Similar information for practitioners in Office B was obtained from an employee because the administrator was not available at the time.

Using this information twenty subjects were selected from the Child Welfare Department of Office A⁷ and only two subjects were selected from the Public Assistance Department.⁸ Approximately an equal number of subjects was selected from each of the six units in the Child Welfare Department. Two subjects from each of the four units in Office B were interviewed and completed the questionnaire. Selection of subjects was carried out in such a way as to ensure variation in age, sex, education, training, and seniority.

Subjects were selected from the Child Welfare Department because preliminary investigation suggested that child welfare workers are more typical representatives of their profession than are their public assistance counter-parts. The evidence suggests that the child welfare specialty is more professionalized than is the public assistance area of service.⁹ Further, the view that public assistance "is not really social work but an investigator's job" is widely held by practitioners in the organization.¹⁰

Originally, the plan was to select respondents from Office A; but the unbalanced sex ratio in the Child Welfare Department,

practitioners being predominantly female, required that subjects from Office B be interviewed.

The major consideration determining the selection of supervisors was their approach to subordinates based on subordinate's descriptions of them.¹¹

As a result of the selection procedure used the subjects are heterogeneous in sex, age, education, training, and seniority. Seventeen of the thirty social workers are males. Approximately one-half the group is under thirty-five years of age. Seventeen respondents hold college degrees. Of these, three hold the Master's degree in social work. Thirteen practitioners have a formal education which varies from a high school diploma to several years of college. Seniority in the organization ranges from five weeks to twelve years. Four subjects have been employed by the organization for less than two years.

The supervisors also vary in age, sex, education, and seniority. Four of the six supervisors are males and four hold college degrees. Of these one holds the Master's degree in social work. All are over thirty-five years of age and all have been employed by the organization for more than two years.

DATA COLLECTION

An interview schedule and a questionnaire were constructed and used to obtain data from the subjects. Each of these instruments

will be discussed separately.

1. The Interview Schedule

The theoretical scheme required techniques which would allow for the discovery of factors and relationships between variables. Consideration of several methods¹² led to a decision to conduct intensive formal interviews to obtain data in the areas of investigation which are specified below.

Interviewing is a useful method of investigation for the exploratory study because it enables the researcher to shift attention from certain aspects of the problem to others as data collection and analysis proceed. It is a method which allows the researcher to explore factors and relationships between factors whose relevance to the problem may not be immediately evident, to collect evidence on "new" aspects of a problem, and to obtain data in areas which have been overlooked.¹³

The interview schedule used for this study was developed in order to obtain data in four areas of investigation. These are: (1) conditions surrounding the subject's entry into the profession and the organization, (2) the subject's career plans and aspirations, (3) his relationships and experiences with superordinates, and (4) his relationships and experience with co-workers.

The first step in the construction of the interview schedule consisted of an examination of the literature which led to the development, evaluation, and reformulation of a number of questions.

An interview schedule developed in this way was pre-tested during November and December 1967 with eight social workers comparable to those with whom it was to be used. On the basis of respondents' reactions to and responses to questions the set of questions was evaluated in terms of its utility in achieving the objectives of the study. A number of questions designed to obtain information in each area of investigation were found not to elicit the required information. Several questions were found to elicit similar kinds of information. A number of questions were narrow in scope. For example, questions in the area of superordinate-subordinate relationships were found to be too specific, directing the respondent's attention to narrow aspects of the relationship.

The first set of interviews provided a baseline for the development and revision of questions, for the evaluation of these questions, and for anticipating the responses to new and revised questions. For example, responses to questions designed to obtain information on the subject's relationships and experiences with others in his role-set led to a decision to develop semi-projective questions to secure data in these areas of investigation.

During January 1968 the revised set of questions was used with five of thirty-eight social workers who constituted the second pre-test group.¹⁴ The interview schedule and specific questions in it were evaluated after each interview. In this way the instrument was revised three times before an acceptable version was developed.

The final interview schedule, used to obtain data from the thirty subjects, included three sets of questions. Each set is discussed in turn and examples are provided.

The first part of the interview schedule consisted of items designed to collect information on conditions surrounding the subject's entry into the occupation and to determine the nature of his present career plans and aspirations.

The questions used to obtain information on the conditions surrounding the subject's entry into the organization were:¹⁵

1. "How did you happen to get into the social work profession?"
2. "Why did you decide to work for this agency?"

In order to determine the nature of the respondent's career plans and aspirations the following question was asked.¹⁶

1. "Do you plan on making a career for yourself in social work?"

Data on the subject's relationships and experiences with formally designated socializing agents were elicited by using semi-projective questions. The major questions asked were:

1. "Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with a supervisor?"
2. "Can you tell me about the more satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work?"
3. "What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you?"
4. "Can you tell me about the less satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work?"

5. "What kinds of things made these relationships less satisfying for you?"

The third section of the interview schedule included semi-projective questions designed to elicit similar kinds of information with regard to the respondent's co-workers.¹⁷ These include:

1. "Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with co-workers?"
2. "Can you tell me about the more satisfying relationships you have had with co-workers since you started in social work?"
3. "What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying for you?"
4. "In what ways have these people helped you?"

2. The Questionnaire

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of questions used to obtain data on the subject's age, sex, education and training, seniority, work history, and role-behavior. The two scales which were designed to measure professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation are incorporated in the second section of the questionnaire.

Construction of the scales and development of the interview schedule was carried on simultaneously. Both instruments were pre-tested using the same two groups of social workers.

The first step in the construction of the scales was determination of the dimensions of professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation. An examination of the literature revealed at least three dimensions on which professionals differ from bureaucratic

employees. These include: (1) the local-cosmopolitan dimension, (2) the dimension of field experience versus professional knowledge, and (3) the dimension of procedural orientation as opposed to an emphasis on client service.¹⁸

The relevant literature was examined, particularly those studies which suggested the content and type of scale items which would be useful indicators of the various dimensions. On the basis of this investigation fifty-one statements implying professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation were developed. Each statement was examined and revised several times.

The next step was to submit the set of statements (typed on 3 x 5 cards) to a panel of five sociologists. The judges were to classify each statement in terms of whether a respondent's agreement with the statement implied adherence to professional principles, adherence to bureaucratic principles, or whether the statement was ambiguous. Those items classified as ambiguous by one or more of the judges were discarded.

Each judge was then asked to re-examine the items which, according to him, implied professional or bureaucratic orientation and to place the items in one of five categories. The statements which the judge assessed as the most useful indicators of each concept were to be placed in the first category. Those items which were assessed as the least useful indicators were to be placed in the fifth category. Only those statements which were assigned to the

first, second and third categories by three or more judges were retained.

The scales developed in this way included twenty-seven items, fifteen of which were indicators of professional orientation. There were five alternatives for each item which ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," weighted from five to one. The magnitude of scores in each scale correspond directly with degree of adherence to principles implied in the scale.

Then the set of items, in the form of a questionnaire, was administered to the first pre-test group of eight social workers in November and December 1967. On the basis of the respondents' reactions to the questionnaire, further revisions of the items were made.¹⁹ Thus the content and wording of several items were modified, new items were constructed, and a few statements were discarded.

The fourth step in the construction of the scales consisted of administering a questionnaire including thirty-two revised items to the second pre-test group of thirty-eight social workers. Administration of the questionnaire was completed during a four day period in January 1968.²⁰

The reactions of at least one-half the group were clearly unfavorable. Several subjects not only expressed their dissatisfaction with the questionnaire but informed the writer that it was being widely discussed and criticized by their colleagues. The strongest

criticism was expressed by several professionally trained social workers. Critical subjects objected to the response categories provided. Another criticism was based on the perception that certain items implied criticism of social work.²¹ Several employees who had some knowledge of scaling techniques expressed concern over the interpretation of findings.

Negative reactions to the questionnaire created problems when respondents were asked to grant interviews. Although the five subjects interviewed willingly agreed to participate it was possible to conduct the interviews only after misunderstandings and objections to the questionnaire had been discussed. One subject stated that he agreed to an interview in order to have an opportunity to give the writer a "blast" about the questionnaire.

Reactions of subjects to the questionnaire caused concern because, at this point, it seemed likely that negative feelings generated by the questionnaire might jeopardize the objectives of the study. Difficulty in obtaining co-operation and in establishing rapport with initially critical subjects was anticipated. It was feared that it would be difficult to obtain complete and accurate information from subjects who were critical of the study.

After all subjects had completed the questionnaire, responses to the items were analyzed and items were selected in the following way. The twenty-five per cent of the subjects with the highest scores and the twenty-five per cent of the subjects with the lowest scores for each scale were used as criterion groups in

order to evaluate each item.²² There were ten subjects in the high group and ten subjects in the low group for each scale.

In order to achieve objectivity in the selection of items a "t" test was performed on each item and the difference between the means of the criterion groups on each item was also computed. To ensure that the scales were "internally consistent" only those items with the highest discriminatory power according to values of "t" and of $X_h - X_l$ were retained.²³

The professional scale and the bureaucratic scale constructed in this way were designed to determine the extent to which respondents subscribe to principles implied in each concept. Each scale consisted of thirteen items used as indicators of three dimensions of professional and bureaucratic orientation.

Two items used as indicators of the local-cosmopolitan dimension as they appear in the professional scale and in the bureaucratic scale are:²⁴

1. "Social workers should criticize the administration if they feel that their criticisms are justified."
2. "Social workers who criticize the administration should be encouraged to work elsewhere."

The dimension of experience versus professional knowledge is implied in the following items which were included in each scale.

1. "Welfare agencies should seek professionally trained people from outside for supervisory positions rather than consider only applicants from within the agency."

2. "In regard to promotions to higher positions, social workers who have a lot of field experience with the agency should be given preference over people from outside with professional training."

The following items imply a procedural orientation as opposed to an emphasis on client service. The first item appears in the professional scale.

1. "Social workers should criticize an agency policy if they feel that the policy is not in the best interests of the client."
2. "Social workers should stick to agency rules even if they personally feel that some rules interfere with giving good service."

The two sets of items were incorporated in the questionnaire in such a way as to appear to be a random assortment of statements. In both scales there are five alternatives for each item which range from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," weighted from five to one. The magnitude of scores on each scale corresponds directly with the degree of adherence to principles implied in each scale. The respondent was instructed to check the response category which most nearly agreed with his own views regarding what the social worker should do.

The distribution of scores on each scale was divided at the midpoint. On this basis each subject was classified as exhibiting either a high or a low degree of acceptance of principles implied in each scale. In other words, relative adherence to professional and to bureaucratic principles is considered jointly.

3. Data Collection: Problems and Procedures

Data were collected from thirty practitioners in the two regional offices over a period extending from February to June 1968. The six supervisors were interviewed in July 1968.

Interviews were requested and arranged by telephone. The interviews, ranging in length from one and one-half hours to two and one-half hours were conducted with respondents in their offices. Interviews with the supervisors were, on the average, three-quarters of an hour in length. Subjects were given the questionnaire after the interview was completed.²⁵

In order to minimize problems which would be created by an adverse reaction to the questionnaire and to ensure independent responses to questions, interviews with practitioners in the same unit were spaced. No more than two subjects from one unit were interviewed during the same week.

There was no indication that the study was a subject of discussion among practitioners. Most subjects who were asked to participate stated that they did not know about it or that they had heard only that a survey was being conducted. Although there was no evidence of a group reaction to the study, a number of problems were encountered with certain respondents.

A major problem concerned the skepticism of a number of subjects over the matter of confidentiality. It was anticipated before the study began that a statement of confidentiality might not mean much to social workers who see this principle violated in their profession.

The explanation that the subject's identity was irrelevant in sociological research was apparently accepted by subjects.

There was no indication that any of the subjects deliberately gave inaccurate information. Comparisons of the accounts of subjects describing the same supervisor provide evidence for the validity of the information they provided.

However, after the first few interviews had been completed it became evident that subjects tended to change the topic or give cursory accounts in response to the question, "Can you tell me about the less satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work?"

Subjects who indicated a reluctance to discuss certain supervisors were reassured on the matter of confidentiality if they gave any indication that this was a concern. Several respondents were also assured that unsatisfactory relationships were not regarded as a reflection upon them because their comments suggested that this was a source of concern. Reluctant subjects were coaxed and questioned until they decided to provide information. None refused to do so although they may have minimized the extent of dissatisfaction and may not have discussed the sources of dissatisfaction fully.²⁶

Responses to the question, "Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with a supervisor?" provided clues as to the actual experiences of subjects with supervisors. Being able to anticipate that the subject had had unsatisfactory relationships and might be hesitant to discuss them prepared the writer in advance.

In brief, the major difficulty encountered in obtaining data in the area of supervisor-subordinate relationships was the reluctance of a number of subjects to discuss supervisors who were a source of dissatisfaction. Although the writer attempted to overcome the problem in the ways discussed a number of cases were not detected and there is incomplete information for them.

Problems of a different order were encountered in obtaining data on peer relationships. Although none of the subjects were hesitant to discuss peers it appeared that relationships with co-workers as compared to the supervisory relationship are of less concern to practitioners. Relationships with co-workers did not appear to be a source of strong satisfaction or dissatisfaction for these respondents. They were inclined to discuss experiences with peers in vague and general terms. A greater number of questions was required in order to obtain data on this area of investigation. Incomplete information led the writer to request a second interview with ten subjects.²⁷

It is felt that some of the problems involved in the collection of data might have been avoided or minimized by following the procedure of interviewing each respondent twice. This procedure would probably eliminate or reduce the problem of boredom or fatigue.²⁸ Equally important, it would enable the researcher to obtain data on important points which were missed during the first interview.

The writer found it impossible to obtain complete information on each of the areas of investigation in one interview. Even though

examination of earlier interviews revealed areas where more data was required, important points were overlooked and questions which should have been asked were not asked. These problems increased the difficulty involved in comparing cases.

The course of action in regard to the timing of the questionnaire and the spacing of interviews was adopted as a result of the reactions of the pre-test group. It was felt that reversing the procedure, i.e. administering the questionnaire before the interview was conducted, would have created problems which would have been difficult to overcome.

Although approximately one-third of the subjects raised objections to the scale items which were similar to those raised by the pre-test group, their reactions as a group was less negative. This may be related to the timing of the questionnaire as well as to the spacing of interviews which gave them less opportunity to discuss the study with others. However, the effects of factors such as the timing of the questionnaire, respondent fatigue, and concern over confidentiality on responses to the questionnaire would be difficult to assess.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The collection and analysis of data was carried on simultaneously. Data collection and analysis were carried out in four stages. That is, from five to ten interviews were obtained

over a period of two to three weeks. The typewritten interviews were examined by comparing the responses of subjects to the various questions in each of the areas of investigation. On the basis of comparisons a report of provisional findings was written up before the next set of interviews was obtained and, in turn, analyzed.²⁹

Comparative analysis of accumulating data in each of the four areas of investigation enabled the writer to uncover important factors, to build up connections between sets of factors, and to construct typologies. Provisional generalizations were made, revised, and elaborated as the data accumulated.

The focus of attention shifted from one area of investigation to another and from certain aspects of the problem to others as data collection and analysis proceeded. The on-going comparison of responses to questions in each of the areas of investigation directed attention to "new" conditions and processes, revealed connections between sets of factors, and revealed areas where more information was required.

As the comparison of cases continued the writer became aware of sets of factors and of interconnections whose relevance to the problem had initially been overlooked or de-emphasized. A number of important points were not pursued because it was not recognized that these were central to the problem. In other instances information on important points had been collected for some cases but the significance of certain variables and the types of connections

between them was not recognized until more data had been collected and examined. As analysis of accumulating data proceeded new questions were designed to secure data on aspects of the problem where data was incomplete.

As a consequence of the procedure adopted, there are gaps in the data. Also, relevant data needed to demonstrate certain connections between sets of factors was not obtained from all of the respondents because some questions were introduced after the analysis had been underway for some time. The frequencies reported reflect such oversights and shifts in focus on various aspects of the problem.

The problems involved in a comparative analysis of qualitative data were intensified by the difficulties associated with the course of action and by problems of data collection discussed in the previous section. The lack of systematic data on certain aspects of the four areas of investigation created difficulties when responses to questions were compared.

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER II

¹ See Twentieth Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare, 1963-6, Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1965.

² The Child Welfare Department includes: the adoptions, temporary wards, homes and institutions, permanent wards, and unmarried parents units. Staff in each unit are responsible for the administration of a specific child welfare program. For example, social workers in the adoptions unit are responsible for the investigation of applications for adoption, approval or rejection of the applicants, and child placement in an adoptive home. Staff in the permanent wards unit are responsible for the placement and supervision of children in foster homes.

The Public Assistance Department includes the following units: public assistance, social assistance, pensions, and the rural unit. Employees in each unit administer one category of financial services. For example, the social assistance program involves the provision of short term assistance for persons who are temporarily unemployed and not resident within the municipality.

³ The agency is a public service organization which possesses the characteristics of a large government bureaucracy. The goal and operation of the agency is, in large part, externally determined by legislative enactment. The central administrative unit of the organization is referred to as Central Office. The stated objectives of this unit are to plan and co-ordinate welfare programs sanctioned in legislation and to supervise the administration of programs by staff in the thirty regional offices. As part of the larger organizational structure local units are formally committed to the achievement of common objectives and to follow the same procedures as set forth in the operating manuals. The direction and supervision of regional office personnel by the Central Office is apparently close and established on a regular basis.

⁴ The following excerpt from the agency's literature indicates that the organization has incorporated professional standards in this area, "the functions of the supervisor are -- to act as an administrative control to ensure that the Department's standards are maintained, to supply needed technical knowledge not only of the Department's policy and procedures but of the principles and practices of good social work, to assist each employee to learn the skills, knowledge and attitudes that will enable him to become an independently functioning staff member who meets work situations rationally. Each

supervisor is responsible for the development of staff in his unit or office."

- 5 Officially, the minimum educational requirements for individuals seeking professional positions with the agency is a university degree. However, the organization has continued to accept applicants who do not meet the minimum requirement. As a result of this selection policy, the professional staff is heterogeneous in education. See Bowker M., Supplementary Report on Adoption in Alberta, Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1965, 7-12.
- 6 Knowledge of social work problems and terminology provided a base for communicating with subjects in their own language. Prior knowledge of agency structure and operation minimized the problems involved in gaining familiarity with an organization and its employees. Prior knowledge was also found to be useful in the development of data collection instruments.
- 7 Three employees were selected from each of the following units; adoptions, foster care, permanent wards 1, and permanent wards 2. Four employees were selected from the unmarried parents unit and from the child protection unit.
- 8 These employees were interviewed because it was learned that they were professionally trained social workers.
- 9 The actual work performed by public assistance workers consists largely of establishing client eligibility for the various financial programs. Staff do not provide counselling services for clients. The provision of expanded professional services to supplement the eligibility determination process would be difficult to achieve given the working conditions, shortage of staff, and their limited qualifications. For example, caseloads in public assistance units are at least twice as large as the average child welfare caseload. Differences between these two social work specialties is not unique to the organization studied. See Wilensky H. and Lebeaux C., Industrial Society and Social Welfare, New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1958; and Wooton B., "The Image of the Social Worker," British Journal of Sociology, 11, 1960, 373.
- 10 A professionally trained social worker who was responsible for the staff training program was asked to comment on the difference between child welfare and public assistance services.

"Workers in child welfare definitely do that what they are doing is social work and they feel that the work done in public assistance is not social work. Jobs in the adoptions unit are the prestige jobs here. They have the best working conditions and the most opportunity to provide counselling. I think that

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY
5408 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

PROF. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

DR. J. A. KILPATRICK
1110 S. DICKINSON DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
TEL. (312) 937-1234
FAX (312) 937-1234

this attitude is general among the workers and it is largely due to their confusion over what casework means. For them casework equals providing counselling services. They underestimate the importance of the more basic services. This affects their feelings about their jobs too. Child welfare workers tend to apologize for being in public assistance."

- ¹¹The selection of supervisors is discussed more fully in Chapter IV.
- ¹²Participant observation was considered and dismissed because of the difficulties of employing this technique. For example, the arrangement of offices is such that only a few employees can be observed at one time. Also, employee's work schedules require them to be out of the office most of the time.
- ¹³Kahn R. and Cannell C., The Dynamics of Interviewing, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
- ¹⁴Ten of the thirty-eight employees were professionally trained social workers.
- ¹⁵See Appendix B for the complete set of questions used.
- ¹⁶Ibid.
- ¹⁷Ibid.
- ¹⁸For a study which focused on the third dimension listed see Francis R. and Stone R., Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy: A Case Study, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- ¹⁹Two respondents raised objections to the statements included in the questionnaire.
- ²⁰See Appendix A for the set of items used.
- ²¹Examples of these items are:
 "Professionally trained workers would be wise to forget a lot of what they learned in social work school when they are in the field."
 "Professional training can interfere with giving good service."
- ²²See Appendix A.

- ²³ According to Edwards the "t" test is of limited utility in determining the discriminatory power of items when the N is less than 25. See Edwards A., Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957, 153.
- ²⁴ See Appendix C for the set of items used.
- ²⁵ This procedure was used as a result of the reactions of the pre-test group to the questionnaire.
- ²⁶ Four interviews were terminated when it became evident that the respondents were unwilling to provide the required information. These were excluded from the study.
- ²⁷ These interviews were obtained during July 1968.
- ²⁸ Respondent fatigue likely had a bearing on the subject's responses to the last set of questions.
- ²⁹ See Lazarsfeld P. and Barton A., "Some General Principles of Questionnaire Classification," in The Language of Social Research, Lazarsfeld P. and Rosenberg M., editors, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955, 83; and Becker H., Geer B., Hughes E., and Strauss A., Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, 1-33.

CHAPTER III

THE CAREERS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the background characteristics, experiences and starting points of the subjects and assesses the implications of these sets of factors for the development of role orientations.

Social workers in this agency exhibit different career patterns. Those who have had different types of careers exhibit variation in certain background characteristics, in the conditions surrounding entry into the occupation, and in present career plans.

The discussion begins with a description of three career patterns. For each pattern, selected background characteristics of subjects, the conditions surrounding entry into the occupation, and present career plans and aspirations are discussed. Secondly, the findings which make it possible to establish profiles for those who hold different role orientations are presented and discussed. Finally, the implications of certain characteristics of the subjects and of conditions surrounding their entry into the occupation for the problem of this study are discussed.

CAREER PATTERNS

Twenty-six of the thirty subjects have worked out their careers as social workers entirely within the employing organization. For these practitioners the social work career has consisted of a series of shifts between positions at one level of the organizational hierarchy. Horizontal movements included moves between regional offices of the organization and moves between departments and units within the large regional office. For several, the career has also included vertical movement from the position of social worker to that of unit supervisor. For four respondents the career has included passage through the professional school and/or employment in another welfare agency prior to entry into the employing organization.

Examination of data reveals that subjects exhibit three types of career patterns. After each type is described, the background characteristics of those exhibiting the pattern, the conditions surrounding entry into the occupation, and present career plans and aspirations are discussed.

TABLE 1

CAREER PATTERNS BY SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Career Pattern	<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Education*</u>			<u>Length of Tenure</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>-35</u>	<u>35+</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>-5yrs</u>	<u>5yrs+</u>
I (n=11)	6	5	11	-	10	1	-	7	4
II (n= 3)	-	3	2	1	3	-	-	3	-
III (n=16)	11	5	3	13	4	8	4	7	9

* Table 1 and subsequent Tables show the number of respondents in each category; the categories under education refer to a college degree (H), some college (M), and less than a college degree (L).

1. Type I

Type I includes employees who began the social work career after completing an undergraduate degree. From Table I it can be seen that they tend to be younger college educated practitioners who began the career with the employing organization.

Of these respondents, none had committed himself to a decision to become a social worker before he entered practice. There is no evidence to suggest that any of the respondents made a firm choice of career or held strong identification with the profession before they began as workers in the field. Their movement into a social work agency can not be interpreted as the behavioral expression of a firm career choice. These subjects began considering a social work job when they were faced with the necessity of working and with the discovery that for liberal arts graduates the alternatives were not unlimited. A social work job with the agency was seen as an available alternative.

The following comments are typical of their responses to the question, "How did you happen to get into the social work profession?"

"I didn't really choose social work. I got a BA in psychology and had just gotten married and needed a job. It was one of the places where I qualified. Other jobs were in selling and I wasn't interested in selling. . . . I really didn't know anything about social work when I started."

"I didn't go into social work for ideological reasons. After taking an arts course you ask what is open. There isn't much to do after you have a BA. I didn't really consider any other occupation . . . I knew very little about welfare agencies when I started. How many people coming out of university know anything about welfare agencies?"

Although similar in starting point these employees are at different stages of development in terms of the changes which are the major concern of this study.

Five subjects have come to make a firm choice of social work as a career and have developed professional commitments as indicated by their career plans. In the words of one practitioner:

"I do plan on a career in social work and more specifically with the department at this point. I intended to go for my MSW this fall but I was given this position and got tied up with administrative problems. The department has an excellent educational leave program . . . I'm going to take educational leave in the fall of '69 . . . I'd be very interested in a higher administration position. It is what I am looking at."

Four practitioners are in the process of coming to a final decision or, more correctly, are in the process of being pressured to make a final decision by investments of time, personal circumstances, and lack of interest in available alternatives. They appear to be resisting the making of a decision to make a career of social work but neither are they seriously considering other alternatives.

The employee whose comment appears below has worked in the field for four years.

"At the present time it is the most permanent. Whether I stick with it or not time will tell. The plans for professional training are there. The chance of me staying with the department are better if I don't get professional training. An MSW opens a lot of doors and if you don't get it the doors are closed. I don't know how long I'll stay with the department . . . I think I am due for a change. You come to a point where everything becomes ritualistic."

Two subjects do not plan to make a career of social work. Neither considered a professional career for the following reasons.

"I don't intend to make a career of social work. I'm getting married in August and I want to be a wife and mother. I never seriously considered going to social work school for that reason. I will work here for a year or more. I intend to work here until I get pregnant. I'm of the old school and want a large family. I want to stay home with the kids. As long as a husband is financially capable the woman should be at home."

2. Type II

The professionally trained employees, all female, display a more firm choice of social work as a career and a greater concern over the problem of choosing a career. They decided to commit themselves to at least a year of study in a school of social work. All completed the two year course and hold Master's degrees in social work. The decision to study social work and the behavioral expression of this choice can be interpreted as indicative of a more firm occupational choice than is the decision or the act of getting a job with a welfare agency.

In the words of one respondent:

"I switched to psychology with social work in mind probably because my mother favored the career and I had a relative in social work. I looked into social work in my second and third years. Then I worked as a social worker with this department for the summer. Gradually I became convinced that social work was the thing for me . . . I also learned from a group of people in my psychology class who had worked in a mental hospital. And the social work association talked to students on campus."

The professionally trained employees indicate that their choice of social work as a career is a firm one and emphasize this when discussing their career plans and aspirations.

"At that point social work was just a job, work I enjoyed doing but if something else had come along that looked interesting I might have changed. Now I feel that social work is all I ever want to do. Before I could have been just as happy not working or doing something else. Now I feel that I couldn't be happy doing anything else."

2. Type III

The careers of sixteen subjects consisted of a period of employment in a non-social work occupation followed by movement into the employing organization, the beginning of their careers as social workers.²

Those for whom social work is a second occupation are predominantly older males (see Table 1) who have worked out their career as social workers entirely within the employing organization. On the average they have worked longer than have their counterparts in Type I, and they are less well educated.

All employees began considering a social work job when they were faced with the necessity of terminating an earlier career due to changes in circumstances including the development of dissatisfaction with the previous occupation.

The following comments suggest the circumstances and events surrounding their entry into the occupation.

"I've always been interested in social problems. As a matter of fact I nearly went into the ministry. I was employed by my church as a layworker and as such I was doing social work . . . I was selling life insurance and wasn't happy with it. I took a drop from nine thousand to four thousand a year when I went here. I got interested in social work through the chaplain of our church. I used to relieve him and conduct church services for the patients at Oliver. I also did visiting at the jail with him so I have been indirectly involved in social work before I started working at it."

"I started in social work before the war. I was doing volunteer work in England after I got married. Because of my husband I had to work and I got into personnel work. I would have been happy to stay in personnel work but I was limited by where I could live. Housing was really hard to find especially for people with children and I would have had to live far away from work. Social work came up and I accepted it."

Thirteen subjects had gained some knowledge of the field and had developed a lay interest in social work problems and clients through participation in volunteer social work or in social work-related activities. Those who had not engaged in such activities had gained knowledge of the agency and its programs from practitioners who were friends.

For five respondents involvement in lay social work activity appears to have been an expression of a previously acquired interest and desire to serve others. The responses suggest that service values and ideals were acquired early in life. These subjects seem to believe that they have realized service values in lay activity and on the job.

Variations in the career plans and aspirations of respondents are related to their opportunities for advancement within the profession and organization.

The three younger practitioners, all male, have developed commitments to the profession and to the employing organization as indicated by their career plans.

"I plan to make a career of social work. I would like to go further as far as education is concerned. It is a broad field and it offers a lot of possibilities. I don't have immediate plans for training but it is at the back of my mind. It is hard to say how long I will stay with the department. Right now I am happy with it but you never know . . . I'd like an administrative position because after meeting people for a certain amount of time it would be nice to be in administration."

Within the older group there is little variation in terms of present career plans and aspirations. With the exception of two employees who are concerned over advancement opportunities, all plan to continue as social workers and see their future within the employing organization.

"I plan on a career in social work. I expect that this will be the last type of work I'll ever do. I've been recommended for a supervisory position but that doesn't mean it will come around in the next little while. This is the only way I can advance myself. I've considered professional training and discarded it . . . too expensive. I have two children and just paid off a student loan . . . The retiring age is 65 so I have about 29 more years to work here.

"If my health and strength hold up I will be here until I am 65. It isn't a temporary job for me. I'm not likely to leave my family and go to Calgary to get my education. If we had a social work school here I'd certainly go."

For most subjects advancement opportunities within the profession are limited by factors such as age, education, and family circumstances. Their advancement opportunities lie within the organization since opportunities for receiving professional training or for securing employment in other welfare agencies are extremely limited. For most a move out of the organization would constitute a move out of the occupation.

Few practitioners are career minded in the sense that they exhibit a great concern with advancing through the ranks of the organization. Eleven give the same reason for their lack of interest or qualified interest in advancement. They want to maintain contact with clients and with other social workers. A move upward involves further removal from field problems, clients, and workers. Subjects

indicate ambivalence or reluctance to advance for this reason.

This perspective on occupational advancement may well be an adaptation to limited opportunities for advancement within the organization and an adjustment to the type of career the individual can expect for the future. For example, a number of employees perceive that their opportunities for advancement are limited.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO ROLE ORIENTATIONS OF SUBJECTS

The subjects were found to combine professional and bureaucratic orientation in ways which yielded the four types of Kornhauser's typology of role orientations.³ Comparison of the cases makes it possible to establish profiles, using the variables of career pattern, age, sex, and education, for those holding different role orientations.

In order to determine the role orientation of each subject the distribution of scores on each scale was divided at the midpoint.⁴ Each respondent was classified as exhibiting either a high or a low degree of adherence to principles implied in each scale, i.e. as either high professional (HP) or low professional (LP), and as either high bureaucratic (HB) or low bureaucratic (LB).

When relative adherence to principles implied in each scale was considered jointly it was found that twelve subjects combine a high professional orientation with a low bureaucratic

orientation (HP-LB). A second type was the low professional-high bureaucratic combination exhibited by nine respondents (LP-HB). The high professional orientation combined with a high degree of acceptance of principles implied in the bureaucratic scale was endorsed by seven subjects (HP-HB). Only two subjects exhibit the low professional-low bureaucratic combination (LP-LB).

TABLE 2

ROLE ORIENTATIONS BY CAREER PATTERNS AND SELECTED BACKGROUND
CHARACTERISTICS

<u>Role Orientation</u>	<u>Career Patterns</u>			<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Education</u>		
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>-35</u>	<u>+35</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>L</u>
HP-LB (n=12)	7	2	3	4	8	8	4	10	1	1
LP-HB (n= 9)	2	-	7	7	2	2	7	3	4	2
HP-HB (n= 7)	1	-	6	6	1	4	3	2	4	1
LP-LB (n= 2)	1	1	-	-	2	2	-	2	-	-

From Table 2 it can be seen that the profile which best describes the employee who combines a high professional orientation with a low bureaucratic orientation is that of the younger male or female who holds a college degree or a social work degree and who entered the social work field immediately after completing his education. Conversely, the profile of the low professional-high

bureaucratic employee is that of the older male who does not hold a college degree and who was employed in a non-professional occupation before his entry into the social work field. Those who hold a high professional-high bureaucratic orientation are males who were previously employed in professional or semi-professional occupations.⁶ They exhibit variation in age and in formal education. The two employees who exhibit a low degree of acceptance of principles on each scale are both young college-educated females who entered the social work field after completing their education.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY

The development of professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation takes place primarily during the course of the career as it is worked out within the institutions and organizations of the occupation.

The majority of respondents have had careers which deviate from what is assumed to be the more typical career pattern, that is, a decision to try out an occupation, entry and passage through its training institutions and entry into the organizations of work.

For most practitioners the social work career has been worked out entirely within the employing organization. This feature of the social work career directs attention to work-related experiences and relationships that have taken place within the context of the employing organization in the attempt to uncover the conditions and processes underlying the development of role orientations.

However, the previous discussion indicates that certain background characteristics and starting points are associated with the different types of role orientations. These variations have important implications for the problem of the study.

For certain practitioners it is likely that professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation were acquired previous to entry into the employing organization.

The professionally trained practitioners likely acquired professional values and commitments before they entered the employing organization. As such, their experiences and relationships with others in the employing organization are anticipated to be less important factors to take into account in explaining the development of professional orientation.

Given the career patterns and characteristics of those who exhibit a high bureaucratic orientation it is difficult to determine the extent to which intra-organizational experiences and conditions have fostered the development of bureaucratic orientation. Thirteen employees who exhibit a high bureaucratic orientation were previously employed, eight in non-professional occupations and in bureaucratic settings. It may be that a degree of bureaucratic orientation was acquired previous to entry into the occupation and the employing organization. Further, those employees exhibiting a high professional-high bureaucratic combination who were previously employed in semi-professional occupations may have acquired a degree

of adherence to professional standards prior to entry into the employing organization.

In the following chapter the practitioner's relationship and experiences with superordinates is examined and the implications of these sets of factors for the development of professional orientation is assessed.

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER III

¹See Appendix D for the background characteristics of each respondent.

²See Appendix D.

³Kornhauser W., Scientists in Industry, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963, 117-26. See p. 5 in this thesis.

⁴See Appendix E for method of determining the high scorers and low scorers for each scale.

⁵Four of the six employees who exhibit a high professional-high bureaucratic orientation were previously employed in semi-professional occupations. These were: personnel work, teaching, insurance adjustor, armed services administration. Two were employed in non-professional occupations, respectively, farming and police work. Of the seven low-professional-high bureaucratic employees six were previously employed in non-professional occupations. These were: barber, city policeman, housewife, stenographer, salesman, store clerk, blue-collar worker in a dairy. One employee was engaged in a professional occupation working as a chartered accountant.

⁶There is no apparent connection between being high or low on either scale and each of the following factors: seniority, previous experience in social work as a layworker, and holding service ideals and values.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUPERORDINATE-SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIP

INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the data on the respondents' relationships and experiences with formally designated socializing agents and attempts to assess its implications for the development of professional orientation. The objective is to examine what goes on between the employee and his superordinate and to determine how this relates to the acquisition of a professional orientation.

Responses to questions in the area of superordinate-subordinate relationships showed that supervisors differ in their approach to subordinates. Three approaches to subordinates based on subordinate perceptions may be labelled as the bureaucratic, laissez-faire, and educative approaches. The construction of this typology and the classification of supervisors described by the subjects is discussed first. Then each approach and subordinates' reactions to it is discussed.

What occurs between the superordinate and subordinate in the apprenticeship relationship is described as coaching and sanctioning. Finally, the implications of coaching and sanctioning, for the development of professional orientation, is assessed.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE TYPOLOGY

A typology of supervisory approaches to subordinates was developed by comparing the responses of subjects to questions designed to obtain data on their experiences and relationships with superordinates.

Comparison of responses to questions such as, "Can you tell me about the more satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work?" revealed the repetition of ideas which made it possible to identify three clusters of behaviors, characteristics, and qualities attributed to supervisors.

Further examination of the three clusters of behaviors and qualities attributed to supervisors revealed two common themes. Supervisors described in the three ways were believed to exercise authority in different ways and to differ in their teaching and consulting efforts.

The respondents referred to a total of seventy-five supervisors. Of these, thirty-four were classified as adopting an educative approach, fifteen as using a bureaucratic approach, and nine as using a laissez-faire approach.¹

A supervisor was classified as using a bureaucratic approach if the subject indicated that the supervisor imposed restrictions on his work-autonomy. A supervisor was classified as using a laissez-faire approach if the subject indicated that he was allowed to work independently and did not receive assistance from the supervisor. Finally, a supervisor was classified as adopting

an educative approach if the respondent indicated that his responsibility and autonomy increased as he gained competence.²

SUPERVISORY APPROACHES

Each approach included in the typology and employee responses to the approach will be discussed in turn.

1. The Bureaucratic Approach

According to respondents' perceptions the bureaucratic supervisor defines his role as primarily that of the administrative superior who emphasizes command and review.³ The bureaucratic approach is characterized by the restrictions which the superordinate places on the subordinate's sphere of autonomy and decision-making authority.

Subordinates ascribed the following qualities and behavior to supervisors who were classified as bureaucratic: a tendency to give orders, to check closely into work done and time put in by the subordinate, to stress rules, procedures, and adherence to agency policy.

Respondents who ascribed bureaucratic qualities and behaviors to supervisors describe them in the following ways.

"I'd like a consulting relationship rather than one where you take orders. I'd like a situation where the supervisor gives me more responsibility as I become more experienced and capable. She does a lot of work, too much. She should delegate more to us . . . Close supervision boxes you in. You can't think for yourself. She supervises too closely. She doesn't allow us to take more responsibility though I have asked for it a number of times. I don't need close supervision. I was given more responsibility when I was younger and new in the field than I am now."

"What gets me is this having to account for every move you are making. They trust you with responsibility for clients and their lives but not with the responsibility of the job. We don't have responsibility for putting in eight hours a day. You have to be in at 8:30. You can't be two minutes late. It is more follow the book and red tape here. They are more concerned about petty things."

Respondents who ascribed bureaucratic behaviors to supervisors, without exception, expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with the supervisor. Dissatisfaction centered on the perceptions that: the supervisor is non-supportive toward them, is ineffective as a supervisor, pressures subordinates to work, does not assist them to learn on the job, and restricts learning opportunities.

Those who described supervisory behavior as bureaucratic tended to interpret his behavior as a reflection upon themselves and their ability. In other words, they perceived the supervisor's attitude towards themselves as non-supportive. They interpreted bureaucratic behavior to mean that the supervisor did not trust them, lacks respect for their judgement, and lacks confidence in their decision-making ability. Subordinates holding these perceptions reciprocated by indicating a lack of trust, confidence, and respect for the supervisor.

As part of the perception of a non-supportive attitude on the part of the supervisor, five respondents expressed the feeling that the supervisor would not protect them should their decisions be challenged by the administration or the agency's publics. Of these, three cited instances in which supervisors had not protected them when a decision was challenged.

Thirteen of the fifteen supervisors to whom subjects attributed bureaucratic characteristics were perceived as ineffective in the position. They were described as lacking the confidence and ability to discharge their responsibilities, reluctant to or incapable of making decisions within their jurisdiction, unable to explain or justify their directions, insecure in the position, and fearful of the reactions of their superiors in the administrative hierarchy. Two respondents had this to say:

"He is afraid to make a decision. He is afraid to wipe his hands without asking Mr. .. first. Clients needs were overridden by his concern with superiors and his fear of making decisions. You had to justify every decision you made. He did this himself to his superiors and he made us feel that we had to do the same."

"Some supervisors are very meticulous. They have to have the last say. They have to have everything done in a certain way. Then you have the more easy-going supervisor who leaves it up to the worker. The last one I had wanted things done a certain way. He didn't understand social work problems. This has repercussions all down the line. You present a piece of work. It may not follow the manual exactly but you had a good reason for doing it the way you did. He would send it back to you. This could have gone through Central Office. He made a mountain out of a molehill. Often we had to do things twice when there was no need for it. When there are eight or nine workers in a unit and work is sent back to everyone the stuff starts to pile up."

All subjects criticized these supervisors for their inability to help them to learn and develop as professionals. Fourteen supervisors, as perceived by the subjects, made little effort to provide guidance. Four subjects indicated that they had been initially receptive to the supervisor, making attempts to get assistance, but that their efforts were not successful. Several subjects reported instances of being discouraged in their efforts to

receive help with decisions. This took the form of referring the subordinate to the manual or of discouraging frequent requests for assistance with problem-solving.

Typically, subordinates attempted to maintain social distance from the supervisor. Eight subjects reported that they restricted efforts to get various kinds of assistance from the supervisor, and turned to more experienced colleagues for advice. For these subjects, the evidence suggests that socialization took place through informal processes, outside the specified roles.⁴

2. The Laissez-faire Approach

As opposed to the bureaucratic approach, the approach of supervisors who were classified as laissez-faire is characterized by the relative absence of restrictions imposed on the subordinate's sphere of responsibility and autonomy.⁵ According to subjects' accounts certain supervisors provided minimal guidance or direction apparently expecting and allowing their subordinates to exhibit a high degree of self-reliance on the job.

Responses to the question, "In what ways have these people helped you?" indicated that certain supervisors provided little guidance or help with decision-making, were not inclined to give orders, and allowed even inexperienced subordinates to work independently.

In the words of two practitioners:

"The first supervisor I had operated on the idea of Little Bo Peep, leave them alone and they'll come home dragging their tails behind them. It was a very loose relationship. I don't know if this is too satisfactory either. Even if the worker is a self-starter there

should be a certain amount of supervision. You need a sounding board and someone to talk over problems. He left me on my own. If he didn't hear anything he let things go. I didn't get much from him . . . My contact with him was limited."

"When I started out I knew nothing about department policy or what I could do or couldn't do. He'd give long speeches but no answers. He wouldn't take a stand. The things we can do and can't do aren't all black and white. There is a lot of grey. It isn't all laid out in the manual. I think he was afraid the case would bounce. Someone would challenge it and he didn't want to be held responsible. I can't think of any way he helped me. He never really did answer my questions. He didn't hold me back in the way of restrictions. He let social workers operate on their own to such a degree that even if you went to him you were still on your own."

All employees who expressed dissatisfaction with this approach indicated that they considered the supervisor as unable or unwilling to help them to learn and develop as social workers. These subjects tended to perceive the supervisor as ineffective and as unwilling to provide protection. Four subjects were initially receptive to supervisory efforts to assist, but their attempts to receive guidance were not successful. Subsequently, they turned to peers for assistance with case problems. In this connection, one respondent said:

"He never really did answer questions. As a matter of fact it became so that if I wanted a straight answer I would to to a fellow worker who was experienced."

Three subjects who were not critical of supervisors who adopted this approach indicated that they did not expect or demand help with problems. According to their reports they made little effort to receive guidance preferring to work independently even as newcomers to the setting.

"In this area it may be different for me. I'm older and have always been independent. I made my own decisions when I started out with a caseload of one hundred and fifty and nobody to teach me. If I'd been younger and hadn't learned to assume responsibility I may have found that I needed more supervision . . . My view was, just leave me alone and let me work."

3. The Educative Approach

According to respondents' descriptions certain supervisors emphasize the role of teacher and social-emotional leader in relation to their subordinates.⁶ The feature which distinguishes this approach from previously discussed approaches is the supervisor's flexibility. That is, according to subjects' descriptions, the exercise of authority and teaching efforts of these supervisors are adjusted to the individual subordinate's level of competence and progress.

As the subordinate develops decision-making abilities and skills in various areas of the work he is given increased responsibility and autonomy. Experienced and skilled subordinates are allowed to work independently whereas the less experienced and capable ones are guided more closely.

In other words, the data suggest that the amount of interaction and the extent to which the supervisor participates in decision-making with the subordinate decreases as the subordinate gains experience and decision-making skills. Unlike the bureaucratic supervisor, the supervisor who adopts an educative approach toward subordinates does not restrict the responsibility of all his subordinates but takes into account differences in their abilities, competence, and skill levels. Unlike the laissez-faire supervisor

he does not allow all subordinates to work independently and without direction.

The following comments are typical of responses to the question, "Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with a supervisor?"

"The supervisor who supervises least is the best. Not the one who just lets things go. The one who if he knows the worker is capable leaves him alone and lets him do his work. The worker who is lacking, he gives more attention. As an adult I feel that if I do my work and perform adequately I should be left alone . . . I went in quite often to the first one. You are new. You don't know anything and you are fumbling. This gets to be less and less. You ask fewer questions. With the supervisor now, I seldom consult him. Only if it is a controversial issue. He gives me confidence to do what I want to do or brings up points that I haven't thought of and makes me revise my thinking on it. I want to discuss this kind of case."

The following illustrative quotation is typical of subjects' responses to the question, "In what ways have these people helped you?"

"He helped by personal direction, by detailed instruction in each area of the work. He gave unstintingly of his time. For the first months he was most helpful. In each administrative area he showed me how to complete forms. He taught me procedure like how to do adoptions and take surrenders from unmarried mothers. Things new to me. It was a spontaneous interest he had in me. He had the ability to detect where I needed help. . . Now I consult him on a need basis. This can be frequent or infrequent. If I have a problem I have no hesitation to go to him. A lot of people can get too dependent on a supervisor. You can get so that you can't do anything on your own. I think a supervisor has to build an independence in the worker by not encouraging dependency. He has to encourage people to become independent by not discussing every trivial issue."

In response to the questions, "What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you?" and "In what ways have these people helped you?" all subjects emphasized the ways in which the supervisor had helped them to learn and to develop on the job.

All subjects perceived the supervisor's attitude toward themselves as supportive. They interpreted the supervisor's efforts to teach and to increase their responsibility to mean that he has interest in them and their professional development, trusts them, respects their opinions, and has confidence in their ability to solve problems. Subjects reciprocated by expressing their trust, respect, and confidence in the superordinate.

For example, eighteen subjects perceived that these supervisors would protect them should their decisions be challenged. Of these, seven cited instances in which the supervisor had defended a solution to a problem.

"I've had a couple of tough cases. In one case the parents had done a fair bit of lying to me. We had a case conference at Central Office. They seemed inclined to jump on me for not finding out. They said that this shouldn't happen. I should have known about it. My supervisor raised my opinion of him. He told them that anyone could make that mistake. He backed me up. You need moral support from the supervisor."

All supervisors who have been classified as educative were perceived as effective in the role. Subjects emphasized that they had the competence to foster the professional development of their subordinates and that they made efforts to do so by teaching and serving as consultants.

All subjects gave evidence of their receptivity to supervisory efforts to teach and assist. Their perceptions of the supervisor and his attitude toward them appears to have fostered receptivity to the socializing efforts of the superordinate. These subjects indicated that they relied on the supervisor for help with

decision-making and problem-solving. In other words, the superordinate was an important or a major source of socialization for the subordinate.

SUPERVISORY APPROACHES: DISCUSSION

The method of classifying the supervisors raises the question of the extent to which the typology and classification of supervisors is based on objective accounts of supervisory approaches and the extent to which it is based on perceptions colored by factors such as the subjects' expectations for work-autonomy and the degree to which these expectations were met by a supervisor.

In order to assess the "objectivity" of the subjects' descriptions of supervisors, supervisors' accounts of the superordinate-subordinate relationship were obtained. The accounts of subordinates who discussed the same supervisor were compared.

1. The Supervisors' Accounts of the Superordinate-Subordinate Relationship

Two supervisors who were classified as bureaucratic and four supervisors who were classified as employing an educative approach were interviewed for the purpose of comparing self-reports of behavior toward subordinates with the perceptions of their subordinates.

The data on supervisory behavior toward subordinates derived from responses to the questions, "Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you like to have with your staff?" and

"Can you tell me something about the way you supervise your workers?" are generally consistent with what their subordinates say of them.

Although all supervisors insisted that they were available to subordinates for consultation and that they encouraged their subordinates to consult them, their responses provide clues which suggest that they differ in the emphasis placed on the teaching role and that they exercise authority in different ways.

As compared to the educative supervisors those who were classified as adopting a bureaucratic approach supervise employees in different ways.⁷ In the words of one supervisor:

"I have a built in parole system. I keep a record of the number of visits they make and the reports they make every month. This consists of the number of visits they make per month in each of the three client categories. If a worker's performance falls I meet with him to find out why. I make allowances for complicated cases that require investigation. The workers are aware that I keep performance records."

All supervisors who were classified as educative indicated that they adjusted the amount and content of supervision according to perceptions of the individual subordinate's progress and level of competence. The following excerpt is typical of their responses to the question, "Can you tell me something about the way you supervise your workers?"

"Whether or not I have individual supervision periods for the worker depends. It varies for each worker depending on how much supervision I think the worker needs. I see some workers on a weekly basis, others once a month and so on. Supervision is used to discuss difficult cases. It is used to bring out the worker's feelings and to make him aware of his feelings toward clients, toward me, his hostilities, prejudices, and so on. It is very important that workers be aware

of their own feelings. . . . I expect them to take on the responsibility for their caseloads and to make their own decisions but I encourage them to come for information and support."

That the teaching role is emphasized may be seen from the following comment which is typical of those made by educative supervisors.

"I feel that most workers want more intensive supervision than they are getting. They need this for support, they need to be reassured on the decisions they make. They need to know where they stand, whether they are doing good or poor work and to find out how to improve. Intensive supervision is important especially in a unit like this where worker-client relationships are mainly unpleasant. I feel that the supervisor should be the main source of support for workers. If the supervisor doesn't provide this workers will support each other. I think this is what happened in my unit. My predecessor was so inadequate that the workers finally made a formal complaint to the director and got his resignation. The morale among the workers here is high and I think it may be due to inadequate supervision."

That the bureaucratic supervisors do not emphasize the teaching role may be inferred from their discussion of the supervisor-social worker relationship.⁸

2. Comparison of Subordinates' Descriptions

Three supervisors who were classified as bureaucratic and eleven supervisors who were classified as educative using the descriptions of two or more subordinates were identified.⁹ With only two exceptions, the subjects' perceptions of a given supervisor in regard to teaching efforts, exercise of authority and reactions to the supervisor are in agreement.

For approximately one-half the subjects agreement may be a result of mutual influence occurring through informal processes since subjects who described the same supervisor are at the present time employed in the same work unit. For the other respondents it is

unlikely that agreement is a result of mutual influence.

However, there are two cases which suggest that perception of supervisory behavior and characteristics may be related to a subordinate's expectations concerning autonomy and to his satisfaction with the amount and nature of the guidance he receives.¹⁰

The professionally trained supervisor described by one respondent was classified as employing a bureaucratic approach.

"She'd discuss cases with you, go over your progress in a case, your thinking on it, your ability to get along with clients and workers, interpret your running records. Find out if you were getting along with clients or whether you hated them . . . I can say I accepted her more readily than I accepted the second and third supervisors I had. Maybe because she was a trained person maybe because I expected too much and was disappointed. There was too much in the casework area. After being in the field for four or five years a lot of it becomes common sense. Maybe I was looking for new and radical ideas and they weren't there. I was looking at cases . . . She was too over-bearing, too top-conscious, too conscious of how her worker's attitudes and behavior were viewed by the rest of the office, too administration conscious. I don't know. I disagreed with the fact that we had to be very punctual. We are adult mature people and can arrive at decisions on our own.

Perhaps she tried to teach me, I don't know. We had regular supervision periods. I consulted her if I had to go against policy a bit and couldn't wait to discuss it in the regular period. As you become more experienced the less supervision you need. If I was a supervisor I wouldn't expect people to run with every little problem. A prime point of supervision is instilling in the worker decision-making skills and the confidence to do this. The supervisor should back the worker up in decisions if there is any feedback on them. The supervisor has to show confidence in what the worker is doing. If the worker feels that the supervisor isn't confident in the job he is doing it will carry over. He starts to feel less confident. In that unit you could feel tension. I'm not limiting it to myself. Others felt the same way too. Some of these things you can't put your finger on.

I didn't feel that I needed the type of supervision I was getting from Mrs. . . . We only discussed cases. I didn't run in with every problem. . . . I didn't run into disapproval about how my cases were going or how I was handling cases. The more I conferred the better we got along. She wanted to be completely aware of everything that went on. Maybe this is where the difficulty lay. I don't feel that a worker should be bothering the supervisor with every little thing but

if I informed her of everything we started to get along. But I seldom went in to consult or see her. No amount of book learning is going to make you a good social worker, doctor, or anything else. You need a combination of education and experience. This is the ultimate. Education can't give you all the answers. There are no pat answers to human problems."

A professionally trained subordinate discussing the same supervisor stated:

"I have been extremely lucky with supervisors I have had. My present one is very much like those I had at school. I have gained so much from them. As I need less supervision they gave me less. Now I can skip supervision periods if I have nothing to discuss."

The supervisor is described in the following way by an inexperienced subordinate.

"She helped me stand on my own feet. She makes me responsible for what I do. I hate taking responsibility. She consults me and involves me in decisions. I consulted her about twelve times a day when I started. She had a lot to do with getting me to the point where I had enough confidence to make decisions myself. I consult her about once a day about the decisions I intend to make. I've made up my mind before I go in for her approval on major decisions I've already made, like a decision to apprehend a kid . . . She points out when I slack off or goof around. I know pretty well where I stand. Now I can judge how I am doing on a case, what progress I am making without her saying anything directly. I'm aware of what she wants, her thinking about my cases and my progress on them without her saying anything about it directly."

This case suggests that variation in perceptions of supervisory behavior and attitudes may reflect different expectations concerning guidance and autonomy. For example, the experienced subordinate who feels capable of working independently may attribute bureaucratic qualities to a supervisor who attempts to participate in problem-solving. The inexperienced or dependent subordinate may emphasize consultation and joint decision-making whereas the former perceives similar supervisory behavior as a restriction.¹¹

In summary: Data from these sources may be viewed as providing validation for two supervisory approaches. Comparable data to validate the laissez-faire approach was not obtained. Supervisors who were classified as using a laissez-faire approach either could not be identified or were not accessible. Further, none of the supervisors described as laissez-faire were discussed by more than one respondent.

THE PROGRESSES: COACHING AND SANCTIONING

These data provide evidence that what occurs between the superordinate and the subordinate in the work relationship may be labelled as coaching and sanctioning.¹² Each process and its implications for the subordinate's development is discussed in turn.

TABLE 3
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR*

Perceived Supervisory Behavior	Frequency of Mention
Coaching	29
Constructive Criticism	24
Support	26
Protection	21

* Table 3 indicates the number of subjects from whose descriptions of one or more supervisors the existence of each process is inferred.

Coaching

Coaching involves the transmission of content, behavioral and attitudinal, through managed experience with clients and work problems. Supervisory efforts to coach also include the provision of learning experiences for the subordinate. As a guiding and channeling process the amount and content of coaching changes with the subordinate's increasing experience.¹³

The evidence that coaching is an important part of the superordinate-subordinate relationship in the "in-service" training situation came from the responses of twenty-nine subjects to the questions, "What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you?" and, "In what ways have these people helped you?" The respondents not only remarked on the nature of the guidance received from supervisors but also commented on the absence of coaching.

The following illustrative quotations are typical of responses to the above questions.

"I like to think that when I work with a case and think of something that may work I can present my views and reasons for trying this out to the supervisor. A supervisor who draws you out about it and asks questions, who gets you to see the merit of your method or maybe gets to see why it wasn't such a good idea. This kind of person rather than one who argues you out of it or gives a flat yes or no."

"They helped me by teaching me policy and regulations. They suggested courses of action you could take with a problem, various alternatives which you may not see. They know the resources and how to go about receiving them better than you do. With the first two I used to run in with every problem that came up. They came with the attitude that the worker is a professional and has responsibility to deal with cases. They were always there but you didn't have to account for every little conversation you had with a client."

In this organizational setting others are able to participate in coaching as they assist the employee to make decisions and to solve problems. However, not all supervisors, as perceived by their subordinates, are capable of assisting their subordinates in the problem-solving process.

"My inservice training consisted of four days in the field with a fellow from Edmonton. I tried to do things the way he showed me but it kept coming back from the supervisor without any direction as to what was wrong. So what I did was to go to the office one Sunday. I got out his files and made guidelines covering points that seemed important to him. That was what saved me from going crazy. He knew what he wanted but he didn't have the time or else he couldn't express what he wanted. He didn't give me any instruction. Now I'm glad he didn't. It made me think and figure out things for myself."

Coaching fosters the learning process by creating a potential for the development of interest in work problems and for the discovery and development of skills, abilities, and aptitudes. The evidence that coaching creates a potential for the above kinds of changes includes direct reports by respondents that such changes have occurred as well as indirect evidence on the basis of which the occurrence of change is inferred.

Fifteen subjects indicated that the development of skills, aptitudes, and interest in social work was related to supervisory efforts to coach. Respondents who were critical of certain supervisors stated or implied that supervisors had not facilitated their development on the job.

"She worked us just like a supervisor in a field placement situation working with students in a social work school. She helped us learn social work counselling. I didn't become aware of professionalism until I worked with her. I was more a would-be administrator early in my career and I picked up the professional side of it from her. . . .

What I found most satisfying about these relationships was the potential for growth. If you are not growing professionally you soon lose interest. All the relationships have been growing ones for me. I'm a better administrator and social worker for having associated with these people.

"They were patient and understanding pointing out your attitude toward clients and toward social work. They were capable people and as a result I learned a great deal. They helped me develop my strong points. They were always willing and open for discussion. They encouraged my good qualities and potentials. I learned a great deal through supervision, over coffee, etc."

Sanctioning

Sanctioning involves informing the subordinate of his progress in acquiring skills, knowledge, and personal qualities. It is intended to motivate the subordinate to perform and to change in ways which are defined as desirable by the agents of socialization. The supervisor who assesses the subordinate's progress and level of competence informs him of assessments through informal positive and negative sanctions. These take the form of constructive criticism and support. Sanctioning serves to specify to the employee what the norms are in regard to both behavior and values and to clarify prevailing definitions of what is considered adequate performance and appropriate attitudes.¹⁴

Constructive criticism is intended to assist the subordinate to increase and develop his problem-solving skills. It involves the correction of errors in performance as well as the "correction" of attitudes and beliefs which are considered to interfere with decision-making.

That constructive criticism is an important component of the superordinate-subordinate relationship was derived from the accounts of twenty-four subordinates and three supervisors. Of these, twenty-four respondents remarked on constructive criticism as an important part of their development. Ten subjects commented on the lack of constructive criticism from certain supervisors.

"We discussed our attitudes toward clients and discussed cases with the supervisor. I have a thing about people who lie to me. We would talk about my hostility and harshness toward clients who lied to me. I didn't know how to get some of them off their back-sides and I got harsh with them. I can't do much about my attitudes except be aware of them. In discussions with the supervisor I became aware of this by seeing his reactions."

"I know I can learn from them. They give me some feedback. You could work for some supervisors a thousand years and never know if the work you were doing was lousy or not. I get feedback on the type of work I am doing. It's important that you know how you are doing. It is almost like writing exams at university. When you get a per cent you know where you stand in the system. When you are working you have no idea where you stand. A lot of workers are in a kind of nothingness. It is hard for them to know how they are doing if the supervisor does not tell them if they are great or if they are lousy. Success isn't that great and you feel defeated a lot of the time."

Constructive criticism facilitates learning by creating a potential for the development of skills, abilities, and positive self-definitions. To the extent that the supervisor corrects his subordinates he is motivating them to develop valued skills and qualities.

"He should remain fairly objective. You should be able to go to him for a validity test on what you are doing. If he is too close to you he won't level with you for fear of hurting your feelings and won't commit himself so you don't know how you are doing. I like a person who tells you you are wrong if you are. One experienced enough and knowledgeable enough to help you grow in the job and show you where

you go wrong. People who are close friends can't criticize each other and social workers have to do this. If you can't criticize you have lost your supervisory function."

Support involves the expression of positive feelings toward the subordinate as a person and an employee. It refers to the positive effective feedback; approval, acceptance, encouragement, which the subordinate receives from his supervisor. Twenty-six respondents indicated that support is an important element in the superordinate-subordinate relationship.

"If you have a difficult client and don't know how to handle it they support your ideas. They acknowledge that you are upset, you can cry on their shoulder. This is a demanding job and you need someone on your side."

"It is her tendency to accept me as I am. She understands my personality. She knows how I mean the things I say. She has awareness of me as a person."

Supervisors also provide protection for their subordinates. This consists of accepting responsibility for a decision made by the subordinate in the event that it is challenged or questioned by the administration or the agency's publics. Justifications or rationalizations for the subordinate's decision are presented to those who challenge it. Twenty-one respondents emphasized the importance of supervisory protection. In the words of one of them:

"I like confidence and assurance that I will be backed up in any decision I made. Decisions can be challenged by central office, the courts, by other agencies. If this happens I don't want to be out on a limb."

Support fosters the development of positive self-definitions. The supervisor who provides support and encouragement fosters the subordinate's feelings of self-confidence, certainty, and pride in

skills.

Changes in self-definitions are attributed to the efforts of supervisors by sixteen subjects. Of these, fifteen give evidence of developing positive self-definitions as an incumbent of the occupational role. Five employees indicated that feelings such as uncertainty, insecurity, and lack of confidence were associated with experiences they had had with certain supervisors. Two practitioners stated:

"She had a lot to do with getting me to the point where I had enough confidence in myself to make decisions. I think more of myself as a person because of her. By pointing out fallacies in the things I thought about myself and my work she made me realize that the things I thought about myself and my work were groundless. She made me see it as a lack of self-confidence rather than a lack of ability. I feel now that I have more ability than I thought I had."

"You learn techniques and theories at school so I had intellectual knowledge. But I really never used myself with people until I worked for him. He developed in me a genuine concern for people that I hadn't had before. His attitude showed and you couldn't work for him and not acquire some of this feeling. He really encouraged my love for the work."

Support and protection facilitate the learning process by enabling the subordinate to cope more effectively with the threat generated by the need to solve complex problems and by enabling him to take advantage of available learning situations.

"They expressed their confidence in me and helped me to gain confidence quickly. When you go out and meet clients you are hesitant and insecure and it can be detrimental. Clients pick this up and they lose confidence in you . . . You have to have confidence and relay it to clients so they can be helped. The first interviews are frightful. You ask supervisors what to say and do and they tell you that when the situation comes up you will know what to say and do. Just having someone you look up to express confidence in you is tremendous."

"I like to get backing for what I try. You will try something on the spur of the moment. This is okay if you have backing from your supervisor and don't get stuck if what you try doesn't work."

In summary: Coaching and sanctioning create a potential for changes which foster identification with the occupational role and with other professionals. That such changes have taken place is interpreted as an indication that some self-identification with the occupational role and with others in the profession has taken place.

IMPLICATIONS OF SUPERVISORY APPROACHES FOR PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION

A comparison of cases revealed a connection between the subjects' experiences and relationships with superordinates during approximately the first two years of employment and role orientation held. The findings previously discussed suggest that the superordinate-subordinate relationship has important implications for the development of role orientation.

The role orientations of subjects working for supervisors classified as using each type of approach are discussed in turn. Then an interpretation of findings based on the previous discussion is given.

TABLE 4
PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY APPROACH AND RESPONDENTS'
ROLE ORIENTATIONS

Supervisory Approach	Role Orientations			
	<u>HP-LB</u>	<u>LP-HB</u>	<u>HP-HB</u>	<u>LP-LB</u>
Educative	7	-	7	2
Bureaucratic	2	3	-	-
Laissez-faire	1	4	-	-
Not Classified	2	2	-	-
Total	12	9	7	2

TABLE 5
BEHAVIOR ATTRIBUTED TO THREE SUPERVISORY APPROACHES*

Supervisory Approach	Supervisory Behavior							
	<u>Coaching</u>		<u>Constructive Criticism</u>		<u>Support</u>		<u>Protection</u>	
	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>
Educative (n=16)	16	-	10	1	13	-	11	-
Bureaucratic (n=5)	2	2	-	2	-	2	-	2
Laissez-faire (n=5)	-	5	-	2	-	-	-	1

* Table 5 presents data on the participation of each type of supervisor in the four types of behaviors as received by respondents. The Table refers only to experiences with supervisors reported during the first two years of practice; n refers to the number of respondents who worked for each type of supervisor.

TABLE 6

CHANGES ATTRIBUTED TO THREE SUPERVISORY APPROACHES

Supervisory Approach	Type of Change			
	<u>Changes in Self Definition</u>		<u>Changes in Skills, Attributes</u>	
	<u>Positive Change</u>	<u>No Change or Negative Change</u>	<u>Positive Change</u>	<u>No Change or Negative Change</u>
Educative (n=16)	9	-	10	-
Bureaucratic (n=5)	-	3	-	3
Laissez-faire (n=5)	-	1	-	2

Table 6 refers to changes in self-definition, skills, abilities and interests which respondents attributed to supervisory efforts to assist.

The Educative Approach

From Table 4 it can be seen that fourteen of the sixteen subjects who were supervised during the first years of employment by a supervisor who was classified as educative exhibit a high professional orientation which is combined with a high or a low degree of adherence to bureaucratic principles.¹⁵

For these employees, the findings suggest that the formally designated socializing agent was a major source of socialization into the occupational role. It is the supervisor who adopts an educative approach toward subordinates who, according to their accounts, makes the greatest effort to coach and sanction subordinates, especially the inexperienced subordinate. As shown in Table 5, all subjects indicate that the supervisor was a source of coaching.

Approximately two-thirds gave evidence that the supervisor engaged them in constructive criticism, supported them, and provided protection. For one-third there is incomplete evidence in regard to supervisory participation in these processes.

These findings suggest that the educative approach fosters employee receptivity to supervisory efforts to socialize. All subjects perceived their supervisors as effective. Approximately two-thirds perceived the superordinate to hold supportive attitudes toward themselves. It appears that these perceptions are based, in part, on successful attempts to receive guidance and on supervisory behavior such as protection of the subordinate.

The coaching and sanctioning efforts of the supervisor combined with employee receptivity to his socializing attempts create a potential for changes which foster identification with the occupational role. As indicated in Table 5, approximately one-half the sample attributed the development of skills, abilities, and positive self-definitions to the efforts of their supervisors. The efforts of supervisors to coach and to sanction creates a potential for another type of change, the development of identification with the socializing agent.

Three of the five employees who were supervised during the first years of practice by supervisors classified as bureaucratic exhibit a low professional orientation.

These respondents indicated that the supervisor's attempts to coach and sanction were minimal. With the exception of two

subjects who reported supervisory attempts to coach, none gave evidence that supervisors participated in constructive criticism, support, or protection.

All subjects perceived the supervisor as ineffective and as non-supportive toward them. These perceptions appear to derive, in part, from unsuccessful attempts to receive guidance.

Perceptions of this nature operate to insulate the subordinate from supervisory influence and to make him less receptive to attempts at influence. For example, supervisory efforts to coach were rejected by two subordinates. All subjects gave evidence that they attempted to restrict contact with the supervisor. Of these, four report turning to more experienced co-workers for guidance and information.

To the extent that supervisors make less effort to socialize their subordinates and to the extent that subordinates' perceptions make them less receptive to supervisory attempts to influence, the supervisor's role as socializing agent is minimized. Under the above conditions there is a lower potential for the changes which facilitate the development of identification with the occupational role. It is also unlikely that the supervisor will become a reference individual, an important source of approval and confirmation for his subordinates.

The Laissez-faire Approach

Four of the five subjects who were supervised during the first years of practice by supervisors classified as employing a

laissez-faire approach exhibit a low professional orientation.

The subjects report that supervisors' efforts to coach and to sanction were minimal. For example, all stated that the supervisor made no attempt to assist them with decision-making.

For two subjects the evidence suggests that socialization took place through informal processes, outside the specified roles. Three subjects indicated that they did not make attempts to receive guidance but preferred to work independently.

Under the conditions that the supervisor's attempts to coach and sanction are minimal, that the subordinate perceives the supervisor as ineffective, and that the subordinate desires to work independently, the supervisor is not a major source of socialization into the occupational role. There is less likelihood for the occurrence of changes which foster identification with the occupational role. It is also unlikely that the subordinate will develop attachment to or come to identify with the socializing agent.

THE FIRST YEARS OF PRACTICE

Data bearing on the relationship between supervisory approaches and role orientation held suggest that the experiences with supervisors which take place during approximately the first two years of practice are most crucial for the development of professional orientation.

This finding is consistent with those of Sibley,¹⁶ Becker and Carper,¹⁷ and of Wright,¹⁸ who have investigated the development

of occupational identification within the graduate school context. These studies demonstrate that important changes in occupational identification take place during the first year of graduate work. Graduate students come to develop or fail to develop commitments during this period.

During the first years of practice the recruit comes to see how the field is defined and presented by its practitioners. The recruit seeking information and acceptance is, during this period, likely to be most receptive to cues and expectations of his role partners. As the employee learns the role he comes to identify with it and to develop attachment to others in the field. Those who socialize him into the occupational role play an important part in bringing about such changes.

It is not suggested that experiences with supervisors during later stages of the career do not have a bearing on professional orientation. However, within the context of this organization, for most employees, opportunities for further professional development is limited. To the extent that the development of professional orientation is related to the supervisor's ability and efforts to define and present the field, the evidence suggests that later experiences are likely to have less bearing on the development of professional orientation.

The majority of supervisors described by the subjects lack professional training. In other words, the majority of those who are designated as socializing agents do not themselves possess enough

professional knowledge and skill to further the professional development of the employee although most of them do possess the knowledge and skills needed to complete the training of the recruit in the way required by the goals of the organization.

As such, the recruit soon "catches up" with his untrained supervisor or at least gains sufficient knowledge and expertise to perform the organizational role with minimal supervision.

SUMMARY

Examination of data in the area of superordinate-subordinate relationships led to the construction of a typology of supervisory approaches or ways of exercising authority. Supervisors who differ along this dimension were labelled as adopting an educative, bureaucratic, or laissez-faire approach to subordinates. Data obtained from six supervisors to whom the subjects referred, along with information on twelve supervisors who were described by two or more subjects, are viewed as providing some validation for the bureaucratic and educative approaches. Comparable data for the laissez-faire approach was not obtained.

The subordinates' responses to questions on the supervisor-social worker relationship indicate that coaching and sanctioning are an important part of the interchange. Data obtained from four supervisors and from subordinates discussing the same supervisor are regarded as providing some validation for this finding. Self-reports

from the subjects suggests that coaching and sanctioning create a potential for changes which foster the development of identification with the occupational role and with others in the profession.

The findings suggest that the supervisor's approach toward subordinates, particularly during the latter's first years of practice, has important consequences for the acquisition of professional orientation.

Fourteen of the sixteen subjects supervised by superiors classified as adopting an educative approach display a high professional orientation. Three of the five employees who were supervised during the first years of practice by a bureaucratic superordinate exhibit a low professional orientation. Of the five employees who were subordinate to laissez-faire supervisors during the first years, four exhibit a low professional orientation.

Supervisors who employed an educative approach tended to emphasize coaching and sanctioning of subordinates, whereas for those employing other approaches, efforts to socialize the employee were less stressed aspects of the relationship.

There are also differences in subordinate receptivity to supervisory influence associated with the types of approaches. Employees perceived the educative supervisor as effective and supportive and gave evidence of their receptivity to his efforts to socialize. Those supervisors who adopt a bureaucratic or a laissez-faire approach were perceived by most subordinates as ineffective and

non-supportive. Such perceptions lower employee receptivity to supervisory influence.

As compared to the other approaches, the educative approach in which coaching and sanctioning are emphasized facilitates the development of professional orientation by promoting the development of identification with the occupational role and by fostering the development of attachment to the supervisor.

The findings also suggest that the effects of supervisory approaches may differ on employees who vary in age, sex, education, and seniority. This is discussed in Chapter VI where an examination of the background characteristics and experiences of subjects exhibiting a low professional orientation brings into question the bearing of supervisory approaches for the development of role orientation.

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER IV

- ¹There was incomplete information for seventeen supervisors. These were excluded from the analysis.
- ²This included experienced subjects who reported making decisions independently and inexperienced subordinates who reported joint decision-making as well as those who directly reported that their autonomy increased as they gained expertise.
- ³The bureaucratic approach is comparable to the authoritarian style of leadership discussed by Lippit R. and White R., and to the directive style of supervision identified by Baumgartel. See Lippit R. and White R., "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Readings in Social Psychology, Newcomb T., Maccoby E., and Hartely E., editors, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958, p. 496; and Baumgartel H., "Leadership, Motivation, and Attitudes in Research Laboratories," Journal of Social Issues, 12, 1956, 30.
- ⁴The socializing efforts of co-workers is discussed in Chapter V.
- ⁵Lippit and White, op cit., and Baumgartel, op cit. The laissez-faire approach based on subjects' perceptions is similar to the laissez-faire type of leadership discussed by Lippit and White.
- ⁶The educative approach is comparable to the participatory style of supervision identified by Baumgartel when the supervisor's relationship with inexperienced subordinates is considered.
- ⁷The second bureaucratic supervisor stated that she had individual supervisory periods for each worker.
- ⁸One supervisor was reluctant to discuss the supervisor-social worker relationship. He confined his discussion to the statement that he was available for consultation to all staff members. The second supervisor reported coaching and providing support to subordinates. Her discussion of the relationship with subordinates invalidated the descriptions of her subordinates who both perceived her as ineffective and non-supportive.
- ⁹None of the supervisors classified as laissez-faire were discussed by more than one subject.

- ¹⁰ On the basis of the accounts of two subordinates working for the supervisor at different periods in time the same supervisor was classified as laissez-faire and as educative. One subject stated that he did not have any contact with the supervisor for the first six months of employment, needed assistance, and turned to an experienced co-worker. It is felt that the descriptions provided reflect differences in approach of the supervisor to the two subordinates rather than different expectations regarding the amount of work autonomy.
- ¹¹ For the subjects of this study, expectations in this area are related to seniority and, for several employees, to age. Senior subordinates expect and want more independence whereas the less experienced indicate that they want more direction. Four older employees expressed a desire to work independently even as recruits.
- ¹² This includes data obtained from the four supervisors classified as educative.
- ¹³ For a discussion of coaching see Strauss A., "Coaching," in Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Biddle B. and Thomas E., editors, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966, 350.
- ¹⁴ See Sherlock B. and Morris B., "The Evolution of the Professional: A Paradigm," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 27.
- ¹⁵ See Appendix F for a discussion of the deviant cases.
- ¹⁶ Sibley E., The Education of Sociologists in the United States, Russell Sage Foundation, 1963, 89-108.
- ¹⁷ Becker H. and Carper J., "The Development of Identification with an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, 51, 1956, 289.
- ¹⁸ Simpson I., "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 47. Wright, C. "Changes in the Occupational Commitment of Graduate Sociology Students," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 55.

CHAPTER V

PEER RELATIONSHIPS

The superordinate is not the only socializing agent available to the recruit. Examination of responses to the question, "What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you?" and "In what ways have these people helped you?" provide evidence that peers as well as the supervisor play an important part in the socialization process.

TABLE 7

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF CO-WORKER BEHAVIOR

<u>Perceived Co-Worker Behavior</u>	<u>Frequency of Mention</u>
Coaching	23
Constructive Criticism	12
Support	15

COACHING AND SANCTIONING BY PEERS

Co-workers have an opportunity to coach each other as they discuss work problems and cases. Knowledge and expertise is transmitted and exchanged as peers assist each other to reach solutions and to make decisions. Peers assist each other by proposing alternative solutions to problems, providing information on procedures, policy, available resources, clients and by assisting each other to apply these to specific cases.¹

That coaching is an important part of what occurs between co-workers has been demonstrated in studies such as those of Blau,² Simpson,³ Rosen and Bates⁴ and others. For this study the evidence that coaching is an important element in peer relations came from the responses of twenty-three subjects to questions designed to obtain information in this area of investigation.

The following illustrative quotation is typical of the subjects' responses.

"When I started one worker in particular was a great help. He had started about three months before me and he had learned policy. He showed me how he solved problems and explained things to me. I never had to bother the supervisor that much. This fellow enjoyed helping me. There were other workers who had been there longer and we both went to them too. We talked generally about what should be done in a certain area. You get new ideas from other workers. You get new points from them that you can use in your work. They have ideas on how you can do the job better and this can be passed on. We do this all the time. They try to help you when you run into a problem. Sometimes five heads are better than one. You draw on their good points."

"They were ready to assist me and any new worker to get into the field. They went out of their way to give me a hand. That was a satisfying experience. They helped by giving their impressions, they talked about trials and tribulations they ran into on their caseload. I could draw my conclusions from what they said. They would tell me that this is the way they would do it and I'd weigh it. An unbiassed opinion helps."

Coaching by peers, as with coaching by supervisors, fosters the development of skills and abilities. Five subjects directly commented on such changes. For other subjects that such changes have occurred is inferred from comments such as those above.

"They know the mechanics of doing a program and they add to your philosophy. When you are testing one philosophy with the other, you may reject yours and accept theirs, or depending on the relationship

it may strengthen the philosophy you have. You are constantly bouncing ideas around and talking shop. They help you to polish your skills and they add to your philosophy. You are learning from them. They may learn something from you."

Peers also sanction each other.⁵ Fifteen employees emphasized the support and encouragement which they receive from peers. That is, they emphasized the importance of peers as a source of acceptance and encouragement.

The comments here are typical of the responses of these practitioners to the question, "In what ways have these people helped you?"

"They help you by providing a shoulder to cry on, a place to let out your frustrations. It makes you realize that you are not alone, that you have common problems, make the same mistakes . . . They provide company when you are miserable."

That constructive criticism is a part of the interchange between co-workers came from the responses of twelve subjects. For example, receiving confirmation from a peer for one's solution to a problem is a form of approval. Likewise, lack of confirmation or suggested alternatives are ways of correcting or criticizing the others' solution.

"I discuss with other workers all the time. If you have a situation you know the answer but you are a bit hesitant. He may suggest another way of looking at it. You see how they feel about your approach. You go to someone who is able to help you with the case. They help most by interpreting policy or if you run into new situations you ask someone who has handled it and ask them what the outcome was."

Constructive criticism and support from peers facilitates work and learning by enabling employees to cope more effectively with the anxieties generated by the need to solve complex problems and by contact with frustrating clients. Further to the extent that peers

fail to confirm a solution to a problem the employee is motivated to seek alternatives and to try a different approach.

Criticism and support also foster the employee's feelings of confidence in himself and his ability. For example, receiving confirmation for a solution from a peer indicates to the employee that he is on the right track increasing his certainty in the appropriateness of his approach to a case.

SUPERVISORS AND PEERS AS SOCIALIZING

AGENTS

The supervisor's approach to subordinates and employee reactions to supervisors has a bearing on peer relationships.

There is evidence that certain supervisors who were classified as using an educative approach use the peer group or individual peers as an aid in socializing the recruit into the occupational role. For example, twelve subordinates and one supervisor reported that supervisors encouraged consultation among subordinates and assigned recruits to more experienced subordinates who are given responsibility for providing the neophyte with a basic orientation to clients and to the setting.

"You get a new worker and the supervisor will ask you take him with you. You help him in this way. You tell him the reasons why you are doing what you are doing. You explain policy to him after you leave the client. You support him and try to encourage him. He may get discouraged and confused because there is so much to learn. You tell him others are in the same boat. Maybe you point things out to him like the way he treats people. He may be too forceful with a client and the client rebels against this treatment. Things like that."

"Several come in on a regular basis because they feel and I feel that they need direction . . . I encourage them to discuss cases with me and with each other. I don't mind if a new worker goes to another worker rather than to me. As a matter of fact I just asked an older worker to help the new one and let them work together on it."

Nine subjects who perceive the supervisor as effective and supportive indicated that they relied more on the supervisor than on their peers although he encouraged discussion and consultation among workers. These employees tended to emphasize that peers are important sources of information with regard to agency policy, programs, and procedures. For example,

"When you work for the government there are so many forms to fill out. You can't run to the supervisor every time. Co-workers are invaluable. I had an experienced office mate. I asked her questions endlessly for the first few months. The supervisor door may be closed and you need an answer. They help you with statistics and with procedure."

There is a tendency for these employees to rely on the supervisor for help with decision-making and problem solving particularly on important or difficult cases. They turned to the supervisor for confirmation and for alternative perspectives on a case.

Nine subjects who perceived the supervisor as effective and supportive reported turning to peers for help with decision-making and for confirmation on important cases primarily when the supervisor was not available for consultation.

"I went to other people in the unit for a lot of information. If there was a counselling problem I waited for the supervisor. If I had a problem I waited for the supervisor. If I had a problem I tried to figure it out for myself before I went in to him . . . He is an excellent counsellor."

Five senior workers who perceive the supervisor as supportive and effective expressed a reluctance to encroach upon what they define as the supervisor's sphere of responsibility.

"We don't advise each other on cases. If there is a need to discuss cases we go to the supervisor. They consult me on matters of policy because I've been here a long time. Any major decisions are made between the supervisor and the worker. If they want to consult me on something important I advise them to go to the supervisor."

Peers serve as important sources of coaching and sanctioning for each other and particularly for the neophyte whom they assist to adapt to the setting. That peers can aid the socialization process as directed by the formally designated socializing agent is based on the accounts of eleven subjects. There is evidence that employees support the supervisor not only by helping to train new employees and by restricting their coaching efforts so as not to encroach upon the supervisor's authority but also by taking complaints to the supervisor rather than to a higher authority and by indicating their willingness to assist the supervisor in other ways.

Their aid supports the aims and efforts of the supervisor. For example, peers' willingness to assist each other with routine cases, to exchange information, and to aid the adjustment of the new employee eases the supervisor's burden leaving him more free to assist subordinates with the more complex decisions and difficult cases.

Findings from several subjects suggest that supervisors who use a bureaucratic approach make less effort to use the peer group or individual peers as an aid in the socializing process. According to

one supervisor and two subordinates, supervisors who employ a bureaucratic approach encourage subordinates to discuss cases with them rather than with other workers. Further, according to three subjects they are reluctant to delegate responsibility for the training of recruits to senior subordinates.

"We could help train new workers and tell them a lot about policy. I've been here so long that I know policy backwards. We could do a lot to take the load off the supervisor . . . She is very self-disciplined and does a lot of work, probably too much. She should delegate more to us."

"My door is always open and the workers know that regardless of how busy I am they can feel free to come in and discuss problems or for information. I would rather have them bring their case problems to me than have them discuss it with other workers. . . I don't encourage or discourage discussion of cases among workers and I know that they often discuss cases."

There is evidence that peers become a more important or a major source of coaching and sanctioning when the supervisor is perceived as ineffective and non-supportive. The findings indicate that under such conditions socialization takes place primarily through informal processes. Subjects who held such perceptions reported that they relied more on their peers than on the supervisor for support and for help with case problems.

Twelve subjects described periods in their career when they relied on fellow workers rather than turned to the supervisor.

"Now it is rarely that I go in to discuss a case or consult with my supervisor. I haven't had that much success in getting advice and find it better to do things on my own. I go to two of the workers to discuss cases. The supervisor tries to give advice but I haven't found it that helpful. We depend a lot on each other for moral support and for advice. This is more true now . . . Moral support is pretty important in this kind of work. We get advice from each other. You tell someone about your case, what you intend to do or what you have done. They give their opinions on your courses of action. They can propose alternatives."

"I can't think of any way he helped me. He never really did answer my questions. As a matter of fact it became so that if I wanted a straight answer I'd go to a fellow worker who was experienced."

Not only do peers become a major source of socialization into the occupational role, they can encourage each other to resist the socializing aims and efforts of the supervisor by undermining his efforts to exert influence.

It seems likely that the new employee's perception of supervisory ineffectiveness and non-support are derived from, or at least buttressed by, the example set by more senior workers in the unit as well as by his lack of success in getting guidance. The new employee is not in a position to evaluate the socializing efforts of his supervisor yet new employees do indicate that they perceive the supervisor as ineffective and non-supportive.

The clearest evidence that these kinds of discriminations are learned through informal processes in which more experienced employees convey to the neophyte their attitudes and assessments of the supervisor comes from one case.

This quotation illustrates the ways in which co-workers undermined the supervisor's efforts to teach an employee who had been working for approximately five weeks.

"I consult with him about five times a day. He is taking extra time with me because I am a new worker . . . He isn't up to date on policy. He forgets or overlooks a policy when he is advising workers. He doesn't admit he is wrong and gives excuses. He doesn't like responsibility and won't back up his staff. If a worker takes his advise it may be in error and she gets hell from central office. If they complain he will say that the worker misunderstood his directions or else didn't do what he said.

The supervisor is really afraid of his superiors. He is afraid to say much on policy. He takes policy as it is. He is insecure in the position and afraid for his neck. This is one reason why staff feel he isn't qualified for his position.

None of the workers like the supervisor and will bypass him when ever possible. They think he's incompetent. In coffee breaks we often try to figure out how he got his job, why he got it, how much education he has. We have speculated on this but nobody knows anything about his background.

I feel uncertain about his advice at times. I feel that his answers don't seem quite right. I go to the senior worker for advice. I try to get out of conferences with him and get information from the other workers.

Once I disagreed with him and didn't follow his advice because I felt strongly about the case. I felt that taking his advice would have created unnecessary hardship for the client and I wasn't breaking any rule. He seemed appalled but he didn't oppose it . . . Once I asked him to help me with a problem that couldn't wait. He would have had to stay a few minutes after closing time and I kidded him about it. He didn't say anything and when I came back with the file he was gone.

I often go to senior workers rather than to him. The senior workers go to him only when they have to. I rely on what they say and I often take their word over that of the supervisor. I admire one of the older workers and go to her. She is a nurse and very good with people. The other workers think she is one of the best workers they have known."

Subordinates can undermine the superordinate's authority and efforts to socialize in other ways. Items of evidence from a total of eleven cases include: complaining to or asking the supervisor's superior for assistance, mutual encouragement to maintain social distance, and, in one case, working to have a supervisor removed from his position.

In brief, under the above conditions and experiences with supervisors peers become a major source of coaching and support for each other. Further, peers can undermine the supervisor's authority and his attempts to provide guidance.

OTHER CONDITIONS BEARING ON SOCIALIZING EFFORTS

There are several conditions and characteristics which have a bearing on superordinate-subordinate and peer relationships.

Age has implications for the employee's relationship with others in the role-set. Three older employees made it clear that they wished freedom to follow their own paths even as newcomers to the setting and the occupation. Although these subjects indicated that they needed supervision they expressed a desire to work independently. Such expectations and attitudes have inclined them to effect a more isolated adaptation to the setting and to work problems. They were uncritical of supervisors who permitted them to work autonomously even during the first years of employment.

None of the younger employees exhibit the more isolated mode of adaptation. They were critical of supervisors whom they perceived as not facilitating their adaptation and tended to turn to their peers for guidance.

"I had so much experience before I go in the department that I wouldn't place such heavy demands on them as a younger worker might. I wouldn't have such great expectations for supervision."

The socializing efforts of others in the role-set are also influenced by conditions of work which prevail in an office or a unit. Within the smaller offices, the size of the peer group and the lower ratio of subordinates to supervisors provides more opportunity for interaction. A number of subjects indicated that the superordinate-subordinate ratio and the pressure of work, i.e. high caseloads, limited

their opportunity to consult and discuss with others.

Under more favorable conditions of work interaction with others is not only more frequent but ties between peers tend to be based on the need for exchanging expertise as well as on the need for moral support to face common problems. Ties based on the exchange of expertise appear to be less characteristic in settings in which working conditions are unfavorable.

The influence of work conditions is suggested by the comments of employees who have worked in small rural offices and by those who are working in Office B.

A senior employee compares his experiences in two offices of the organization.

"There is a sharing of knowledge back and forth. This is satisfying. People here are all experts in facets of the work and are willing to help. If it is anything to do with alcoholism or mental illness they come to me. I can refer them to resources. We didn't have that on the North Side. We were companions in adversity. There is so much pressure there. The bitching there was purposeful and negative. We really meant it. The bitching here is not. There is less pressure here and we just let off steam by bitching . . . At the other office we didn't consult. We talked about mutual problems. We didn't have time to sit down. We didn't have a unit meeting for three years . . . I dreaded going to work. It was physically impossible to get through the work."

TABLE 8
ROLE ORIENTATION BY PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY APPROACH AND SOCIALIZERS*

Role Orientation	Supervisor's Approach												
	<u>Educative</u> (n=16)			<u>Bureaucratic</u> (n=5)			<u>Laissez-faire</u> (n=5)			<u>Unclassified</u> (n=4)			
	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Socializer</u>	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Peers</u>	<u>Self</u>
HP-LB	7	5	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-
LP-HB	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	2	1	1	1
HP-HB	7	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LP-LB	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Table 8 refers only to the experiences of respondents with socializers during approximately the first two years of employment. There is overlap between the supervisor and peer categories because certain subjects reported both as socializers. The Table also reflects cases which could not be categorized because information was not obtained.

From Table 8 it can be seen that for eleven subjects who exhibit a professional orientation peers as well as the supervisor were a source of socialization during the first years of practice. Further, eight of the nineteen employees who exhibit a high professional orientation began the career in small offices of the organization.

Those who hold a low professional orientation (n=11) exhibit two modes of adaptation; seeking out peers and self-reliance. For six subjects who sought out peers to aid their adaptation, the data suggest that peers were the major source of socialization into the occupation. Three subjects reported that they worked largely independently of supervisors and of peers.

There is evidence for five professionally oriented employees that supervisors used the peer group to aid the recruit's adaptation to the setting. The socializing efforts of peers operate to reinforce or supplement the aims and efforts of the superordinate creating a climate more favorable to the development of identification with the occupational role and with the professional group.

Studies have demonstrated that pressures arising from the demands of work and the need to concentrate on problems in the instrumental area create social emotional problems which individuals must attend to if these are not to interfere with activities in the instrumental area.⁶

These findings suggest that when the supervisor is perceived as ineffective and non-supportive employees tend to express

their dissatisfaction by undermining the superordinate's efforts to exert influence and by maintaining social distance. The evidence, previously discussed, suggests that under such conditions social-emotional problems become more prominent, a consequence not only of pressures of work but also of tensions arising from dissatisfaction with the superordinate and subsequent efforts to minimize supervisory influence.

For the six subjects who turned to peers the evidence suggests that social distance was maintained. For one subject (see page 101) there is evidence that subordinates undermined the socializing efforts of the supervisor. For those supervisors who make attempts to socialize the employee into the occupational role, these efforts are blocked by peers who develop mechanisms to maintain social distance.

Under such conditions the picture which emerges is that of a group of employees bound by supportive ties which enable them to cope with common pressures which are intensified by strain between themselves and the superordinate. In other words, strain in the superordinate-subordinate relationship interferes with the socializing efforts of both supervisor and co-workers by intensifying social-emotional problems and by directing the expenditure of effort away from the tasks of work and learning. These conditions do not create a climate favorable to the development of identification with the occupation.

SUMMARY

These findings indicate that the role of co-workers in the socialization process tends to change in relation to the type of approach adopted by the supervisor and in relation to subordinate perceptions of the supervisor associated with each approach.

As recruits, fourteen of the nineteen professionally oriented employees worked for supervisors who have been classified as educative. Findings based on five cases suggest that supervisors used the peer group to aid the recruit's adaptation to the field. In any case, eleven of these subjects indicated that peers as well as the supervisor were an important source of socialization. Under these conditions the socializing efforts of peers reinforce supervisory efforts creating a climate favorable to the development of identification with the occupational role and with the professional group.

Those employees who exhibit a low professional orientation, as recruits, were exposed to conditions and experiences and experiences less conducive to learning. Seven subjects worked for supervisors who have been classified as using a bureaucratic or a laissez-faire approach to subordinates. Of these, six were assisted to adapt to the setting by peers who were the major source of socialization. Three older employees tended to make a more isolated individual adaptation to the setting. These findings suggest that the above sets of conditions do not facilitate the development of important types of identifications.

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER V

- ¹See Blau P., The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955, Part 2; and Becker H., Geer B., Hughes E., Strauss A., Boys in White, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- ²Blau, op cit.; and Blau P. and Scott R., Formal Organization: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- ³Simpson, I., "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 47.
- ⁴Rosen R. and Bates A., "The Structure of Socialization in Graduate Schools," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 71.
- ⁵See Sherlock B. and Morris R., "The Evolution of the Professional: A Paradigm," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 27; and Blau, op cit.
- ⁶Bales R., Interaction Process Analysis, New York: Addison-Wesley Press Inc., 1950; and Bales R. and Strodtbeck P., "Phases in Group Problem Solving," in Group Dynamics, Cartwright D. and Zander A., editors, New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

CHAPTER VI

ROLE ORIENTATION

INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters the findings on conditions and processes which occur in the interchange between the recruit and others in the role-set who act as socializing agents were presented and discussed. The implications of various conditions and processes for the development of professional orientation were assessed.

This chapter presents findings which suggest that supervisors' efforts to socialize may foster or "interfere" with the development of bureaucratic orientation.

Then certain background characteristics and experiences of subjects who exhibit different combinations of professional and bureaucratic orientation are related to intra-organizational experiences with others. On the basis of this examination the implications of intra-organizational experiences with others discussed in the previous chapters are re-assessed.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BUREAUCRATIC ORIENTATION

Given the characteristics of those who exhibit a high bureaucratic orientation it is difficult to determine the extent to which intra-organizational experiences and conditions have fostered adherence to bureaucratic principles. It is likely that

these subjects developed adherence to bureaucratic principles before entering the social work field. For example, for those who exhibit a high professional-high bureaucratic orientation it appears that intra-organizational experiences fostered the acquisition of professional principles which these employees combined with a previously acquired adherence to bureaucratic principles.¹

While the two ideal conceptions, professional and bureaucratic, can be held simultaneously and in varying degrees by any one individual it is usually assumed that professional and bureaucratic conceptions involve incompatible demands and competing sources of loyalty.² There is a suggestion of potential conflict because of incompatible demands and alternatives provided by each conception. That ideal conceptions prescribe conflicting programs and guidelines for action is supported by empirical work.³

In this regard, it might be noted that employees who hold a high professional-high bureaucratic orientation have, on the professional scale, scores which fall toward the lower end of the distribution although they are above the midpoint. That is, their scores on the professional scale are lower than are the scores of those who combine a high professional with a low bureaucratic orientation.⁴ Likewise, their scores on the bureaucratic scale tend to be lower than are the scores of those who exhibit a low professional-high bureaucratic orientation.

Of course, it is not possible to determine the degree of adherence to bureaucratic principles held at the time of entry into the organization. But there is a possibility that for these employees

(HP-HB) allegiance to bureaucratic principles declined as they developed adherence to professional principles but that the previously acquired bureaucratic orientation interfered with a higher degree of acceptance of professional principles.⁵ This interpretation would be consistent with the recent suggestion that, "even a slight allegiance to the opposing role frustrates the dominant one."⁶

It is suggested that the efforts of supervisors and peers which foster the development of professional orientation, might, at the same time, undermine a previously acquired allegiance to bureaucratic principles. Likewise, for employees who enter the field without allegiance to bureaucratic principles, the efforts of others in the role-set which foster the development of professional orientation would at the same time discourage the acquisition of bureaucratic orientation.

Findings based on a number of cases suggest that a tendency to rely on the supervisor facilitates the development of a professional orientation and simultaneously "interferes" with the development of a bureaucratic orientation by lessening the subordinate's need to rely on organizational policies and rules.

Findings discussed in Chapter IV indicate that most respondents expressed a need to rely on the supervisor particularly during the first years of practice. The majority reported that they did rely on certain supervisors for support and protection as well as for constructive criticism and guidance in problem-solving.

The sources of dependency needs and the emphasis on the supervisor's role appear to be based on the recruit's lack of professional preparation for the role as well as on certain features of the profession and the work.⁷ Whatever the source of the emphasis on the need to rely on the supervisor, this concern was characteristic of the group.⁸ In fact, a number of respondents exhibited, what to an outsider, might appear to be an unusual degree of reliance on their supervisors and to emphasize the need for such attachments.

The subjects' accounts indicate that they developed attachment to and dependence on supervisors classified as using an educative approach whom they perceive as effective and supportive. They looked to the supervisor not only for technical assistance and guidance in decision-making but also for protection, support, and for evidence that they were learning and performing adequately.

Seven subjects provided evidence that supervisors who adopt an educative approach are more flexible with regard to the administration of services encouraging the employee to apply rules in ways which benefit the client and protecting the subordinate by assuming responsibility for the decision.

"He went by the book whereas the one we have now will bend the rules usually for the book of the client . . . My supervisor bends the rules so if I have a case requiring this I go to him to discuss it. If I had a supervisor who wouldn't approve of this I'd likely bend the rules first and tell him about it later. I'd stick my neck out. I did stick my neck out on private adoptions. It didn't do much good."

One of the qualities attributed to supervisors who were classified as bureaucratic is the tendency to be rigid with regard to

the administration of services and the application of rules. They encourage their subordinates to adhere closely to organizational policy and procedure.

"I can't stand people who say it's in the manual. The manual is a guideline but it's not god. They had no imagination and were pretty inferior beings. They go by the manual. They are afraid. I don't like a supervisor who lacks confidence."

Four employees, who, as recruits were subordinate to bureaucratic or to laissez-faire supervisors display a preoccupation with policy and rules.

One practitioner implied that he relied on his knowledge of organizational rules rather than on others in the role-set.

"He didn't give me any instruction and now I am glad he didn't. It made me think, figure out things for myself. It's easy to become dependent on others . . . I don't feel that workers should go in to the supervisor with every little thing. The rules are there and you administer according to policy. I was aware of rules and policy and didn't go in with every little thing. Relying on others means you are dependent on them for making decisions."

Another subject in response to the question, "The social worker should stick closely to agency rules and leave interpretation of agency rules to his supervisor," stated,

"I don't see how agency rules can be interpreted in two ways," and "I don't understand this. The rules are for the good of the client. If they weren't they'd have been changed."

There is evidence for twelve of the professionally oriented employees which suggest that they are less preoccupied with agency rules. These subjects tended to state that they did not follow rules closely and to be critical of supervisors who emphasized procedures.

"I refused to check on clients which I was supposed to do. He felt he had to tell me to do so although I know he wasn't happy with it either. The counselling and investigating roles can't be combined and I just didn't do it. He let it go. I wouldn't care if a client took the department for every cent. I guess I just don't have enough loyalty to the department."

The supervisor who facilitates the development of dependence on himself through his efforts to coach and sanction reduces the subordinate's need to emphasize and adhere strictly to procedures.

The subordinate does not have to adhere strictly to policy due to fear that his solutions will be challenged. He knows if and when his decisions will be supported should he deviate from agency procedures. The employee does not have to protect himself by rigid adherence to rules when he perceives that the supervisor will support decisions and assume responsibility should his decisions be questioned by higher authorities or the agency's publics. Supervisory protection frees the subordinate from a preoccupation with organizational procedure, enabling him to develop a more professional concern with providing service to clients.

The supervisor's responses provide the subordinate with evidence in regard to his level of performance and progress. He does not have to assure himself that he is competent and able by emphasizing his knowledge of procedure and his skill in applying rules. He can stress competence in the provision of client services rather than proficiency in following and applying rules.

When the supervisor is unwilling to protect the employee and/or is perceived as unwilling to support decisions the employee is thrown on his own resources and has to take the consequences of his decisions. The subordinate may emphasize the importance of a thorough knowledge of rules, strict application of rules to specific cases, and may equate rule-following and client service in the interest of self-preservation.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE RELATED TO ROLE ORIENTATION

The background characteristics and intra-organizational experiences of those exhibiting each type of role orientation are described. Then these variations are considered jointly in order to assess the bearing which they have for the development of different role orientations.

As discussed in Chapter III, the respondents combined professional and bureaucratic orientation in ways which yielded the four types found in Kornhauser's typology of role orientations. These are: the high professional-low bureaucratic, the high professional-high bureaucratic, the low professional-high bureaucratic, and the low professional-low bureaucratic combinations.

Those employees who exhibited a high professional-low bureaucratic orientation are similar in certain background characteristics and starting points. They are younger men and women who hold a college degree or a professional degree and who

TABLE 9

ROLE ORIENTATIONS BY SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY APPROACH*

<u>Role</u>	<u>Background Characteristics</u>											<u>Supervisor's Approach</u>			
<u>Orientation</u>	<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>		<u>Education</u>			<u>Previous Occupation</u>		<u>Length of Tenure</u>		<u>Educative</u>	<u>Bureaucratic</u>	<u>Laissez-faire</u>	<u>Unclassified</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>-35</u>	<u>+35</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>-5</u>	<u>+5</u>				
HP-LB (n=12)	4	8	8	4	10	1	1	1	2	5	7	7	2	1	2
HP-HB (n= 7)	6	1	4	3	2	4	1	4	2	5	2	7	-	-	-
LP-HB (n= 9)	7	2	2	7	3	4	2	1	6	5	4	-	3	4	2
LP-LB (n= 2)	-	2	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-

* Previous occupations of respondents for whom social work is a second career are classified as semi-professionals (P) and as non-professionals (NP).

entered the social work field after completing their education.

From Table 9 it can be seen that those who combine a low professional orientation with a high bureaucratic orientation tend to be older males without degrees who were previously employed in non-professional occupations. Those who hold a high professional-high bureaucratic orientation are males who were previously employed in semi-professional occupations. They vary in age and education. Both employees who exhibit a low degree of adherence to principles implied in each scale are young, college-educated females who entered the field after completing their education.

Employees who exhibited the four types of role orientations not only differ in the above ways, they also have had varying experiences as recruits with others in the organization.

Table 9 indicates that fourteen subjects who combined a high professional orientation with either a high or a low degree of adherence to bureaucratic principles have had similar experiences with others in the role-set early in their career. That is, as recruits, they worked for supervisors who have been classified as adopting an educative approach and relied on peers as well. In the previous chapters it was proposed that role-partners, by creating a potential for the development of identification with the occupational role and with others foster the development of professional orientation.

On the other hand, those who exhibit a low professional-high bureaucratic orientation were subordinate, as recruits, to

supervisors who have been classified as employing either a bureaucratic or a laissez-faire approach to subordinates. The evidence suggests that for the six subjects who turned to peers to aid their adaptation, peers were the major sources of socialization into the occupational role. Reported attempts to maintain social distance from the supervisor suggest that strain in the superordinate-subordinate relationship may have interfered with the socializing efforts of both peers and supervisors. Three employees who made an individual adaptation to the field indicated that they were more isolated from interpersonal influences which these findings suggest create a potential for the development of professional orientation.

Comparison of the background characteristics and experiences with intra-organizational experiences for subjects exhibiting different role orientations requires a re-assessment of the implications of intra-organizational experiences, particularly supervisory approaches, for the development of role orientation.⁹

The reactions of subjects to each type of approach identified were similar for subjects who varied in age, sex, education, seniority and previous work experience.¹⁰ However, it is proposed that the implications of a given supervisory approach for the development of professional and bureaucratic orientation may differ for subjects who vary on the above characteristics.

The young employee without previous experience in the organizations of work, having had less opportunity to develop an

occupational self, may be more preoccupied with structuring his work life and with defining his place within the occupational system. He may be expected to devote more energy to seeking information and be more receptive to and dependent on cues from others in the role-set. Older employees with previous work experience have developed work attitudes and definitions of situations which they may be expected to use to reduce the ambiguity of a new occupational setting. They may be less dependent on others in the role-set to aid their adaptation.

A similar line of reasoning may be used with reference to seniority. As compared to initial experiences, experiences with supervisors and with peers later in the career may have different implications for the development of professional orientation.

Similarly, differences in education and training are expected to modify the impact of intra-organizational experiences within the role-set. For example, professional training acquired before entry may operate to insulate the subordinate from the "effects" of bureaucratic or laissez-faire approaches to subordinates.¹¹

These findings suggest that participation of others in the role-set in coaching and sanctioning creates a potential for changes which promote identification with the occupational role and with others. However, the extent to which the potential for change is realized is likely to be related to characteristics which make for differences in receptivity to the efforts of others. Thus, an

educative approach may be more influential for the development of professional orientation for young employees than for their older counter-parts who have been previously employed.

In brief, it is proposed that the implications of types of supervision for the development of professional orientation or failure to develop professional orientation are modified by the above-mentioned factors.

Given the combinations of background factors and experiences, approaches adopted by supervisors and experiences with peers for subjects who exhibit different role orientations it is not possible to demonstrate the extent to which these various sets of factors have contributed to variation in role orientation.

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER VI

- ¹The four employees who were previously employed in semi-professional occupations may have been exposed to professional norms and standards before they entered the organization. Degree of professional orientation can not be attributed solely to their experiences with supervisors and others in the role-set.
- ²See Blau P. and Scott R., Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962, 71; and Scott R., "Professionals in Bureaucracies: Areas of Conflict," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., editors, Professionalization, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, 604.
- ³See Corwin R., "Role Conceptions and Career Aspirations," Sociological Quarterly, 10, 1965, 65; and Corwin R., "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, 1960-61, 604.
- ⁴See Appendix D for the scores of each subject.
- ⁵There is a possibility that four employees developed some degree of professional orientation before entry into the organization.
- ⁶Corwin, op cit.
- ⁷In professional social work culture supervision is conceived of in terms of education rather than command. Although the supervision "complex" has come under criticism within the profession it is regarded as a necessity for social workers regardless of training. The extent to which the emphasis on supervision operates to create dependency particularly in the inexperienced worker is a moot question. For the view of the social work profession see Ohlin L. and Pivan H., "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2, 1956, 43.
- ⁸Twenty-six employees comment on the need for supervisory support and twenty-one discuss the need for protection when cases are challenged.
- ⁹This applies particularly to the implications of the bureaucratic and the laissez-faire approaches for the development of professional orientation.

- ¹⁰The exceptions are three older employees who preferred to work independently as recruits. These were not critical of their supervisors.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the conditions and processes which underlie the development of role orientations among members of the social work profession who are employed in a public welfare agency.

The study focused on the direct interchange between the individual and others in his role-set who acted as his socializing agents. The dimensions of the socializer-socializee relationship which were investigated included authority, affectivity, and the socialization content transmitted. A second focus of the study was to explore the implications of certain background characteristics and conditions surrounding entry into the occupation for the development of role orientation. Third, scales were constructed to measure role orientation.

Thirty social workers employed in two Edmonton Regional offices of a public welfare agency were interviewed and asked to complete the questionnaire. In addition, six supervisors were questioned on various aspects of the supervisor-social worker relationship.

Data on the subjects' relationships and experiences with others in the role-set, supervisors and co-workers, was obtained through the use of semi-projective questions. The interview was also used to obtain relevant background information, information on

the respondent's career plans, and data on the conditions surrounding his entry into the occupation.

Scales were constructed to measure, respectively, professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation. The role orientations of subjects were determined by dividing the distribution of scores on each scale at the midpoint. Each respondent was classified as exhibiting either a high or a low degree of adherence to principles implied in each scale.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Using the scales constructed, it was found that the subjects exhibited the four types of role orientations which have been identified for professionals working in different organizational contexts.¹

The scales appear to be useful instruments to measure the role orientation of employees. The interview data have provided some validation for the scales as measures of these concepts (with the exception of the organizational loyalty dimension of bureaucratic orientation.)²

The bureaucratic scale devised for this study implied three dimensions of bureaucratic orientation; organizational loyalty, an emphasis on rules and procedures, and an emphasis on practical experience in the field. It appears that organizational loyalty is not closely related to the other dimensions implied in the scale.³

This finding is consistent with Glaser's⁴ discussion of the local-cosmopolitan scientist, Bennis'⁵ findings for nurses, and with the more recent suggestions of Blau and Scott.⁶

On the basis of this finding it is suggested that bureaucratic orientation might be more fruitfully investigated and perhaps clarified by constructing scales to measure each dimension.

The findings of this study are in agreement with the findings of previous research. For example, the typology of supervisory approaches developed on the basis of the subjects' perceptions is similar to the typology used by Lippit and White⁷ to investigate the reactions of children to different styles of leadership. The bureaucratic and laissez-faire approaches are comparable to the directive and the laissez-faire styles of supervision identified by Gaumgartel.⁸ The educative approach is comparable, in some respects, to the participatory style of supervision identified by Gaumgartel. The major difference is that the amount of consultation between superordinate and subordinate and the participation of the superordinate in the decision-making process varies in relation to the subordinate's experience and skill. When the supervisor's relationship with inexperienced subordinates is considered the educative approach is comparable to the participatory style of supervision.

These data indicate that coaching and sanctioning constitute an important part of the relationship between the subject and others in his role-set. This is hardly an unusual finding. A number of

authors suggest or demonstrate that coaching and sanctioning are involved in the process of socialization into an occupational role.⁹ What is perhaps unusual is the emphasis which the subjects placed on the supportive and protective aspects of the supervisory relationship and the stress on support in the peer relationship. It might be expected that subjects discussing work-related social relationships would stress the instrumental aspect.

The findings of this study suggest the relevance of two dimensions, authority and affectivity, for the adult socialization relationship and suggest that these dimensions have important implications for the development of role orientations.

Existing work points to the importance of these dimensions of relationships. Studies of socialization during childhood years have demonstrated that authority and affectivity are two major dimensions underlying ways of describing the parent-child relationship. Data on interaction patterns among adults from studies in small group processes such as leadership development and problem-solving reveal that there are basic dimensions of adult relationships.¹¹

The relevance of these dimensions for the socializer-socializee relationship has been commented on by Rosen and Bates,¹² Brim,¹³ and others but authors working in the area of adult socialization have not focused on them nor demonstrated their implications for the outcomes of socialization into an occupational role.

The recent suggestion that "the adult is socialized in a situation of affective neutrality and little power differentiation"¹⁴ does not appear to be applicable to these social workers. Socialization into an occupational role may occur in an on-going relationship which is overtly affectively neutral but for these subjects, descriptions of the superordinate-subordinate relationship indicated that strong positive and negative feelings are invested and that these feelings are associated with perceptions of supervisory approach, effectiveness, and attitudes toward subordinates.

It is felt that these findings demonstrate that subjects' perceptions of supervisory behavior and attitudes make for differences in receptivity to supervisory influence. Thus, perceptions seem to have important implications for the development of role orientation to the extent that the acquisition of a role orientation is related to the supervisor's ability and efforts to socialize the recruit.

It is possible that certain features of the sample, the profession, and the organizational setting may have served to intensify the emphasis on certain components of relationships with others in the role-set.¹⁵ Although the subjects may be unusual in their concern with affect in the superordinate-subordinate and the colleague relationships, it is likely that these are underlying themes in the socializer-socializee relationship which may be less obvious or less stressed in other socialization settings and in other professions. As such, these social workers may be usefully compared to other members of their profession and to other professionals.

On the basis of these findings the dimensions of authority and affectivity in the socializer-socializee relationship and their implications for occupational socialization, particularly for the development of role orientation, is suggested as worthy of further investigation. It is proposed that ways of exercising authority and the subordinate's perceptions of supervisory behavior and attitudes be taken into account in further research in this area.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

The interpretation of certain findings requires that a number of limitations and considerations be taken into account. For example, data to validate the supervisory approaches identified from subjects' descriptions is limited. Data obtained from six supervisors and the agreement between the accounts of two or more subjects describing the same supervisor are viewed as providing some validation for the bureaucratic and educative approaches. Comparable data to validate the laissez-faire approach was not available.

The classification may not be indicative of any real difference in the way supervisors exercise authority. The extent to which the distinction between educative, bureaucratic, and laissez-faire approaches reflect subordinates' perceptions colored by such factors as expectations for work-autonomy and the extent to which it reflects objective differences in the way authority is exercised would be difficult to assess. On the other hand, it is possible that approaches identified in this way might also be revealed through the

use of more objective measures.

Variations in professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation can not be explained solely with reference to intra-organizational experiences and relationships with others during the first years of practice. For two reasons, it is not possible to determine the extent to which differences in supervisory approaches and relationships with peers have contributed to variations in role orientation exhibited by these subjects. First, the number of subjects who began the career with supervisors who have been classified as employing a bureaucratic or laissez-faire approach is small. Second, given the background characteristics and intra-organizational experiences of those who exhibit different role orientations, it is not possible to separate out the contributions of these sets of factors to role orientation.

It is suggested that the implications of any type of supervisory approach and of peer relations for the development of role orientation is conditional upon factors such as age, sex, training, previous occupational experience and seniority. For example, these findings indicated that coaching and sanctioning are an important part of the interchange between the subject, his supervisor, and his role-partners and that these processes create a potential for changes which foster the development of identification with the occupational role and with others. However, the extent to which changes are realized may vary in relation to the above characteristics and experiences.

To conclude: In a study of this nature, "one should always realize that if the people with incomplete data could be properly classified, they might upset the proportions observed."¹⁶

FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER VII

- ¹See Kornhauser W., Scientists in Industry. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- ²Respondents who score high on the professional scale as compared to those who score low are more likely to report that they read professional journals and books, to be critical of certain supervisors and the administration for interfering with client service, to report that they desire to and/or intend to receive professional training in social work, to mention social work courses that they have taken or intend to take, and to be less concerned with adhering strictly to rules and policy.
- ³Interview data provide validation for the scale as a measure of the extent to which the employee is oriented to procedure and of the extent to which the employee emphasizes practical experience in the field. Interview data provides little validation for the scale as a measure of organizational loyalty.
- ⁴Glaser B., Organizational Scientists: Their Professional Careers, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1964.
- ⁵Bennis W., "Reference Groups and Loyalties in the Out-patient Department," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 1957, 481.
- ⁶Blau P. and Scott R., Formal Organization: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco: Chandler Company, 1962.
- ⁷Lippitt R. and White R., "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Readings in Social Psychology, Newcomb T., Maccoby E. and Hartley E., editors, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958, 496.
- ⁸Gaumgartel H., "Leadership, Motivation, and Attitudes in Research Laboratories," Journal of Social Issues, 12, 1956, 30.
- ⁹For example, Sherlock B. and Morris B., "The Evolution of the Professional: A Paradigm," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 27.
- ¹⁰For a review of analyses of descriptions of parent-child relationships see Becker W., "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline," Review of Child Development Research, 1, New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1964.

- ¹¹ See Borgatta E. and Cottrell L., and Meyer H., "On the Dimensions of Group Behavior," Sociometry, 29, 1956, 35.
- ¹² Rosen B. and Bates A., "The Structure of Socialization in Graduate School," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 71.
- ¹³ Brim O., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," Brim O. and Wheeler S., Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- ¹⁴ Brim, op cit., 37.
- ¹⁵ This emphasis may derive from the lack of professional preparation for the role which is characteristic of the group. It may also be related to the emphasis on the supervisor-social worker relationship which is a feature of professional culture adopted by the agency. Further, the apprenticeship situation in this organization differs from that found in other contexts and occupations. In most settings apprenticeship is primarily a learning situation rather than a service situation. Within this organization the recruit gains experience by rendering services and, theoretically, he is legally responsible for his mistakes. This may be a source of the emphasis on the need for support and protection from the supervisor.
- ¹⁶ Lazarsfeld P. and Barton A., "Some General Principles of Questionnaire Construction," in The Language of Social Research, Lazarsfeld P. and Rosenberg M., editors, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957, 93.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Bales R., Interaction Process Analysis, Addison-Wesley Press Inc., 1950.
- Becker H., Geer B., Hughes E., Strauss A., Boys in White, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blau P. and Scott R., Formal Organization, Chandler Co., 1962.
- Carlin J., Lawyers Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar, New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Edwards A., Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Francis R. and Stone R., Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy: A Case Study, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Kahn, R. and Cannell C., The Dynamics of Interviewing, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Kornhauser W., Scientists in Industry, University of California Press, 1963.
- Marvick D., Career Perspectives in a Bureaucratic Setting, University of Michigan Press, 1954.
- Merton R., Kendall P., and Reader G., The Student Physician, Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Sibley E., The Education of Sociologists in the United States, Russel Sage Foundation, N.Y., 1963.
- Whyte W.H., The Organization Man, Doubleday and Co., New York: 1956.
- Wilensky H. Intellectuals in Labor Unions, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1956.
- Wilensky H. and Lebeaux C. Industrial Society and Social Welfare, Russel Sage Foundation, 1958.

ARTICLES

- Bales R. and Stordbeck F., "Phases in Group Problem-Solving," in Cartwright D. and Zamder A., Group Dynamics, Harper and Row, N.Y.
- Becker H. and Carper J., "The Development of Identification with an Occupation, American Journal of Sociology, 51, 1956, 289.
- "Professional Identification," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966, 101.
- Becker H. and Geer B., "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, 23, 1958, 50.
- "Student Culture in Medical School," Harvard Education Review, 28, 1958, 70.
- Bowker M. Supplementary Report on Adoption in Alberta, The Queen's Printer, Edmonton, Alberta, 1965.
- Borgatta E., Cottrell L., and Meyer H., "On the Dimensions of Group Behavior," Sociometry, 29, 1956, 35.
- Brim O., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," in Brim O. and Wheeler S., Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays, J. Wiley and Sons, N.Y., 1965, 1.
- Corwin, R., "Role Conceptions and Career Aspirations," Sociological Quarterly, 2, 1961, 69.
- "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, 1960-61, 604.
- "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, 19, 310.
- Davis F., Olesen V., and Whittaker W., "Problems of Issues in Collegiate Nursing Education," in Davis F., The Nursing Profession: Five Sociological Essays, J. Wiley and Sons, N.Y., 1965.
- Gaumgartel H., "Leadership, Motivation, and Attitudes in Research Laboratories," Journal of Social Issues, 12, 1956, 30.
- Greenwood E., "The Elements of Professionalization," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966, 9.

- Gouldner A., "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 1957-58, 281.
- Hall O., "Professionalization and Bureaucratization," American Sociological Review, 33, 1968, 92.
- Kornhauser W., "The Interdependence of Professions and Organizations," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966.
- Lazarsfeld P. and Burton A., "Some General Principles of Questionnaire Construction," in The Language of Social Research, Lazarsfeld P. and Rosenberg M., editors, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.
- Levinson D., "Role, Personality, and Social Structure," in Lipset S. and Smelser N., Sociology, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963, 299.
- Lippit R. and White R., "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," in Newcomb T., Hartley E., and Maccoby E., Readings in Social Psychology, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., N.Y., 1958, 496.
- Lortie D., "Professional Socialization," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966, 98.
- Merton R., "Anticipatory Socialization," in Biddle B. and Thomas E., Role Theory: Concepts and Research, J. Wiley & Sons, N.Y., 1966.
- Miller G., "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation Among Industrial Scientists and Engineers," American Sociological Review, 32, 1967, 755.
- Ohlin L. and Pivan H., "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2, 1956, 219.
- Pease J., "Faculty Influence and Professional Participation," Sociology Inquiry, 37, 1967, 63.
- Riessman L., "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, 1949, 308.
- Roscow I., "Forms and Functions of Adult Socialization," Social Forces, 66, 1965, 44.
- Rosen B. and Bates A., "The Structure of Socialization in Graduate School," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 71.

- Scott R., "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966, 265.
- Seeman M. and Evans J., "Apprenticeship and Attitude Change," American Journal of Sociology, 57, 1962, 365.
- Sewell W., "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 349, 1963, 365.
- Sherlock B. and Morris R., "The Evolution of the Professional: A Paradigm," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 27.
- Shills E., "Primary Groups in the Modern Army," in Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of the American Soldier, Merton Rand Lazarsfeld P., editors, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.
- Simpson I., "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 47.
- Strauss A., "Coaching," in Biddle D. and Thomas E., Role Theory: Concepts and Research, J. Wiley and Sons, N.Y., 1966.
- Vollmer H., "Professional Adaptation to Organizations," in Vollmer H. and Mills D., Professionalization, Prentice-Hall, Inc., N.Y., 1966, 291.
- Wheeler S., "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," in Brim O. and Wheeler S., Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays, J. Wiley and Sons, N.Y., 1966.
- Wooton B., "The Image of the Social Worker," British Journal of Sociology, 11, 1960, 373.
- Wright C., "Changes in the Occupational Commitment of Graduate Sociology Students," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 55.
- Wright C. and Turk H., "Introductory Comments on the Socialization of Adults," Sociological Inquiry, 37, 1967, 3.

APPENDIX A

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALES: THE SECOND PRE-TEST

This appendix contains the set of thirty-two items included in the questionnaire presented to the second pre-test group of thirty-eight social workers, determination of the criterion groups for each scale, and the values of "t" and of $X_h - X_l$ for each item.

1. The Items

1. A responsible social worker should not try to put his new ideas into practice if it means going against the rules.
2. There are general principles of social work which social workers should learn before they provide counselling services.
3. Agency rules are just guidelines and the social worker should interpret the rules to fit specific cases.
4. Having to check up on clients to prevent cheating interferes with good social work practice.
5. Social workers who openly criticize the administration should be encouraged to work elsewhere.
6. In regard to promotions to higher positions, experienced social workers who have a lot of field experience with the agency should be given preference over people from outside with professional training.
7. Social workers should stick to agency rules even if they personally feel that some rules interfere with giving good service.
8. Social workers should accept the supervisor's directions even if they personally disagree with them.
9. Supervisors should have professional training rather than only field experience in social work.
10. Organizational rules and procedures interfere with good social work practice.
11. Social workers should attend as many social work conferences and seminars as possible.

12. If a social worker isn't able to stick strictly to the rules in a given case the supervisor rather than the social worker should be responsible for interpreting the rules to fit such cases.
13. Social workers should try to live up to the standards of their profession even if the administration does not seem to respect these standards.
14. Field experience is more important than professional training in social work.
15. Professionally trained social workers would be wise to forget a lot of what they learned in social work school when they are in the field.
16. The social worker should stick strictly to rules and leave interpretation of agency rules to his supervisor.
17. Professional training can interfere with giving good service.
18. For the supervisor having administrative ability is more important than having social work skills.
19. It should be permissible for a social worker to violate a rule if he or she is sure that the best interests of the client will be served by doing so.
20. The social worker should try to arrange another time for a visit if the time set is not convenient for the client.
21. The social worker should use his own judgement in interpreting agency rules in specific cases.
22. It's fine for social workers to read social work journals and books if they are interested but it isn't likely to be very useful.
23. In regard to the hiring of supervisors, applicants with professional training should be given preference over those who lack such training.
24. Supervisors should emphasize the importance of getting professional training to staff members.
25. If the agency requires that clients be visited at scheduled times the social worker should stick to the schedule even if he personally feels other cases are more in need of attention.
26. When a social worker and his supervisor come to different decisions on a case the social worker should act on the supervisor's decision.

27. Social workers should not take a definite stand against an agency policy even if they personally disagree with it.
28. Social workers should become acquainted with the work being done by professional social workers in other agencies.
29. Social workers should not drop in on a client without first phoning to arrange a visit.
30. Welfare agencies should seek professionally trained people from outside the agency for supervisory positions rather than consider only applicants from within the agency.
31. Social workers should be permitted to criticize the administration openly if they are sure that their criticisms are justified.
32. Social workers should be permitted to take a definite stand against an agency policy if they are sure that the policy is not in the best interests of the client.

2. Determination of High and Low Groups: The Professional Scale

Subject Scores	Frequency	Proportion	C. Proportion
52	1	.026	.026
53	0		.026
54	2	.053	.079
55	0		.079
56	2	.053	.131
57	0		.131
58	3	.079	.210
59	2	.053	.263
60	4	.105	.368
61	3	.079	.447
62	2	.053	.500
63	1	.026	.526
64	2	.053	.579
65	0		.579
66	4	.105	.684
67	1	.026	.710
68	1	.026	.736
69	2	.053	.789
70	3	.079	.868
71	0		.868
72	0		.868
73	2	.053	.921
74	2	.053	.974
75	1	.026	1.000

n=38

$Q_1=68.76$

$Q_3=59.26$

Low group: those with a score of 59 or less.

High group: those with a score of 69 or more.

3. Determination of High and Low Groups: Bureaucratic Scale

Subject Scores	Frequency	Proportion	C. Proportion
25	1	.026	.026
26	1	.026	.052
27	0		.052
28	1	.026	.078
29	0		.078
30	1	.026	.104
31	1	.026	.130
32	0		.130
33	0		.130
34	1	.026	.156
35	2	.053	.209
36	2	.053	.262
37	5	.132	.394
38	2	.053	.447
39	7	.184	.631
40	4	.105	.736
41	3	.079	.815
42	1	.026	.841
43	3	.079	.920
44	0		.920
45	1	.026	.946
46	1	.026	.972
47	0		.972
48	1	.026	.998

n=38

 $Q_1=36.27$ $Q_3=40.67$

Low group: those with a score of 36 or less.

High group: those with a score of 41 or more.

3. Thirty-two Items Ranked by their Value of "t".

Professional Items			Bureaucratic Items		
Item No.	"t"	$X_h - X_l$	Item No.	"t"	$X_h - X_l$
30	4.58	1.60	27	3.44	1.20
23	4.11	1.30	8	2.97	1.20
13	4.03	.60	6	2.89	1.10
32	3.95	1.10	17	2.87	1.00
31	3.79	1.20	5	2.68	1.20
24	3.47	1.10	12	2.53	1.00
21	3.15	1.10	1	2.29	1.00
28	2.87	.80	16	2.19	.80
11	2.84	.60	22	2.12	.50
9	2.58	.90	15	2.01	1.90
29	2.55	1.20	14	1.89	.60
19	2.29	.80	7	1.71	.60
20	2.29	.80	25	.57	.20
3	1.09	.40	26	.57	.20
10	1.01	.40			
4	.64	.30			

Items 25, 26, 2, 10, 4, and 11 were not included in the final scale. A number of items were also re-worded.

APPENDIX B

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part I

1. How did you happen to get into the social work profession.
 - a. Before deciding on social work, did you seriously consider any other occupation.
 - b. What occupation were you in before you entered the social work profession. Why did you quit.
2. Why did you decide to work for this agency.
3. Do you plan on making a career for yourself in social work.
 1. How interested would you say you are in an (higher) administrative position.
 2. Do you plan on getting professional training.
 3. How long do you expect to remain with the department.

Part II Relationships with Supervisors

1. Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with a supervisor.
2. People have both satisfying and less satisfying relationships with supervisors. Can you tell me about the more satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work.
 1. What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you.
 2. In what ways have these people helped you.
3. Can you tell me about the less satisfying relationships you have had with supervisors since you started in social work.

1. What kinds of things made these relationships less satisfying ones for you.
2. Do you think that this held you back.

Part III Relationships with Co-workers

1. Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you prefer to have with your co-workers.
2. People at work have both satisfying and less satisfying relationships with co-workers. Can you tell me about the more satisfying relationships you have had with co-workers since you started in social work.
 1. What kinds of things made these relationships satisfying ones for you.
 2. In what ways have these people helped you.
3. Can you tell me about the less satisfying relationships you have had with co-workers since you started in social work.
 1. What kinds of things made these relationships less satisfying ones for you. What did you do about it.
4. Are any of your closest friends in social work.
 1. Where do they work.
 2. How long have you known (person).

The six supervisors were asked the following questions.

1. Can you tell me about the kind of relationship you like to have with your workers.
2. Can you tell me something about how you supervise your workers.
 1. Do you have individual supervision.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

1. Your age on your last birthday.....
2. Your sex. Male.....Female.....
3. Your marital status. Single.....Married.....Divorced....Widowed..Other..
4. Your father's occupation.....
5. Your husband's occupation.....
6. Your education. Less than high school
 Some high school
 High school diploma
 Some college
 College degree
 Some post-graduate work
 Post-graduate degree
 Other, specify
7. What college degree do you hold, if any
 If you hold a college degree, please specify area of specialization
 (major).....
8. Please list, in order, starting with your first position, all the
 permanent positions which you held before you began with the
 Department of Public Welfare.

Position	Major Duties	Length of Service From To	Employer
.....			
.....			

(over)

.....

9. Please list, in order, starting with the first branch in which you worked, all the branches you have worked in since you started with the Department of Public Welfare. Please include the branch or unit you are currently in.

Branch or Unit	Position Held	Major Duties	Length of Service From	To
----------------	---------------	--------------	---------------------------	----

.....

10. Do you belong to any clubs or organizations in the community.
 (i.e. civic clubs, social clubs, etc.)

Organization	Type of Activity	Length of Membership
--------------	------------------	----------------------

.....

11. Do you hold membership in any social work association. Yes....
 No.... If yes, which one(s).....

12. Have you had opportunity to attend any conference related to your work in the last twelve months. Yes.....No.....

Name of Conference	Date of Conference	Location of Conference
--------------------	--------------------	------------------------

.....

13. Have you taken any courses related to your work since you started with the Department. Yes.....No..... If yes, please list.

Course	Approximate Date Taken	Length of Course
.....		
.....		
.....		

14. Do you read books relating to your work fairly regularly.

Yes.....No.....

15. Do you read any of the social work journals fairly regularly.

Yes.....No..... If yes, which ones.....

.....

16. Do you subscribe to any of the social work journals. Yes.....

No..... If yes, which ones

.....

(over)

PART II

The following are statements about social work and social workers.

Please check the answer which comes closest to the way you feel about the statement.

1. A responsible social worker should not try to put his new ideas into practice if it means going against the rules.

Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

2. Welfare agencies should seek professionally trained people from outside for supervisory positions rather than consider only applicants from within the agency.

Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

3. Social workers should not take a definite stand against an agency policy even if they personally disagree with it.

Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree... Strongly Disagree...

4. Social workers who criticize the administration should be encouraged to work elsewhere.

Strongly Agree... Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

5. Social workers should become acquainted with the work being done by professional social workers in other welfare agencies.

Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

6. An experienced social worker should disregard a supervisor's instructions if he or she feels that the best interests of the client will be served by doing so.

Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

7. The social worker should try to arrange another time for a visit if the time set is not convenient for the client.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
8. The social worker should stick strictly to the rules and leave interpretation of agency rules to his supervisor.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree
9. Field experience is more important than professional training in social work.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
10. Professional training can interfere with giving good service.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
11. Social workers should criticize an agency policy if they feel that the policy is not in the best interests of the client.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
12. Social workers should try to live up to the standards of their profession even if the administration does not seem to respect these standards.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
13. If a social worker isn't able to stick strictly to the rules in a given case the supervisor rather than the social worker should be responsible for interpreting the rules to fit such cases.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
14. Supervisors should emphasize the importance of getting professional training to their staff.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

15. In regard to the hiring of supervisors, applicants with professional training should be given preference over those without such training.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
16. Social workers should accept the supervisor's directions even if they personally disagree with them.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
17. The social worker should use his own judgement in interpreting agency rules in specific cases.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
18. In regard to promotions to higher positions, social workers who have a lot of field experience with the agency should be given preference over people from outside with professional training.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
19. Social workers should criticize the administration if they feel that their criticisms are justified.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
20. Professionally trained social workers would be wise to forget a lot of what they learned in social work school when they are in the field.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
21. It's fine for social workers to read social work journals and books if they are interested but it isn't likely to be very useful.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

22. Social workers should stick to agency rules even if they personally feel that some rules interfere with giving good service.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
23. A social worker should not "drop in" on a client without first arranging for a visit.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
24. Supervisors should have professional training rather than only field experience in social work.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
25. Agency rules are just guidelines and the social worker should interpret the rules to fit specific cases.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...
26. For the supervisor, having administrative ability is more important than having social work skills.
Strongly Agree...Agree...Undecided...Disagree...Strongly Disagree...

APPENDIX D

ROLE ORIENTATION, SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS, AND SUPERVISOR'S APPROACH FOR EACH SUBJECT.

Case	Sex	Age	Education	Career	Previous Occupation	Seniority	Supervisor Approach	Role Orient- ation
1	F	35+	MSW	II	--	-5	educative	HP-LB
2	F	35-	MSW	II	--	-5	bureaucratic	HP-LB
3	F	35-	BA	I	--	+5	educative	HP-LB
4	F	35-	BA	I	--	+5	educative	HP-LB
5	M	35-	BA	I	--	+5	educative	HP-LB
6	M	35-	BA	I	--	+5	educative	HP-LB
7	M	35-	BA	I	--	-5	bureaucratic	HP-LB
8	M	35-	BA	I	--	-5	educative	HP-LB
9	F	35-	BA	I	--	-5	educative	HP-LB
10	F	35+	RN	III	nurse	+5	-----	HP-LB
11	F	35+	BA	III	housewife	+5	-----	HP-LB
12	F	35+	XII	III	minister	+5	laissez-faire	HP-LB
13	F	35-	BA	I	--	-5	educative	LP-LB
14	F	35-	MSW	II	--	-5	educative	LP-LB
15	M	35-	BA	III	farmer	-5	educative	HP-HB
16	M	35-	S.C.	III	insurance adjustor	+5	educative	HP-HB
17	M	35-	S.C.	III	teacher	-5	educative	HP-HB
18	M	35+	XII	III	R.C.M.P.	+5	educative	HP-HB
19	F	35+	S.C.	III	personnel worker	-5	educative	HP-HB
20	M	35-	BA	I	--	-5	educative	HP-HB

21	M	35+	S.C.	III	administrator	-5	educative	HP-HB
22	M	35+	XII	III	blue-collar	+5	laissez-faire	LP-HB
23	M	35+	S.C.	III	store clerk	+5	LP-HB	
24	M	35+	B.Comm.	III	chartered accountant	+5	bureaucratic	LP-HB
25	M	35+	S.C.	III	salesman	+5	-----	LP-HB
26	F	35+	BA	III	stenographer	-5	bureaucratic	LP-HB
27	M	35-	S.C.	II	--	-5	laissez-faire	LP-HB
28	M	35+	XII	III	city police	-5	-----	LP-HB
29	M	35+	S.C.	III	barber	-5	laissez-faire	LP-HB
30	F	35-	BA	II	--	-5	bureaucratic	LP-HB

Supervisors

31	M	35-	S.C.			+5		LP-LB
32	M	35+	BA			+5		HP-HB
33	F	35+	MSW			+5		HP-LB
34	M	35+	--			+5		HP-HB
35	F	35+	XII			+5		LP-HB
36	M	35+	S.C.			+5		HP-HB

APPENDIX E

DETERMINATION OF HIGH SCORERS AND LOW SCORERS FOR EACH SCALE

The Professional Scale

Score	f	p	cp
36	1	.030	.030
37	0		.030
38	1		.060
39	1		.090
40	0		.090
41	1		.120
42	1		.150
43	2	.061	.211
44	1		.241
45	1		.271
46	0		.271
47	2		.332
48	1		.362
49	4	.130	.492
50	3	.100	.592
51	2		.653
52	1		.683
53	1		.713
54	3		.813
55	1		.843
56	1		.873
57	1		.913
58	0		.913
59	0		.913
60	2		.974

Midpoint = 49.5

Those with a score of 49 or higher are classified as high on the scale.

The Bureaucratic Scale

Score	f	p	cp
25	1	.030	.030
26	0		.030
27	2	.061	.091
28	1		.121
29	3	.100	.221
30	2		.282
31	4	.130	.422
32	1		.452
33	0		.452
34	0		.452
35	0		.452
36	3		.552
37	1		.582
38	2		.643
39	2		.704
40	2		.765
41	1		.795
42	4		.925
43	0		.925
44	0		.925
45	0		.925
46	0		.925
47	0		.955

Midpoint = 35.9

Those with a score of 35 or higher are classified as high on the scale.

APPENDIX F

THE DEVIANT CASES

There were five cases which do not fit the proposed interpretation of the relationship between supervisory approach and role orientation held. Two employees who began practice with supervisors classified as employing an educative approach exhibit a low professional orientation. Two subjects who began their careers in the organization with supervisors classified as bureaucratic and one subject who worked for a laissez-faire supervisor exhibit a high professional orientation.

Also, the supervisors of four subjects were not classified in terms of the typology because the data required for classification were not obtained. The cases for which more complete responses were obtained indicate that incomplete information was a result of deficiencies in data-collection rather than inherent in the subject's definition of the situation.

The deviant cases and the cases for which there is incomplete information are discussed in turn.

Both subjects who exhibit a low professional-low bureaucratic orientation are young, college-educated females. Failure to develop professional commitment for these employees may be explained with reference to sex-status. It is commonly assumed that the conflict between the demands of family and career blocks the development of professional commitments. This may be considered for these employees.

However, professional orientation as measured by scores on the Likert scale for the professionally trained social worker who exhibits low professional orientation is not congruent with this subject's stated career plans. The career plans of the second employee support this explanation for failure to develop professional orientation.

Examination of the reported behavior of the two employees who began the career with bureaucratic supervisors indicates that these cases do not contradict the interpretation of the relationship between supervisory approach and role orientation held.

For the professionally trained employee it is likely that commitment to professional standards was developed before entry into the organization. Her criticism of the supervisor is based in part on the perception that the supervisor's behavior is non-professional. She has requested and obtained a transfer from the unit.

The second subject stated that his dissatisfaction with the supervisor led to a decision to terminate his employment with the agency. Apparently his decision to return to the organization was based on unsuccessful attempts to find employment. His experiences with supervisors encountered later in the career may explain his decision to make a career of social work.

The professional orientation of the fifth subject can not be satisfactorily explained. The subject is an older, non-college educated female who reports that she has worked independently of

supervisors during the greater part of her career. It may be that she has acquired professional standards through association with her present supervisor who is a professionally trained social worker.

There is limited information on the supervisor-subordinate relationship for three subjects whose first supervisors were not classified in terms of the typology. The two subjects who exhibit a high professional orientation expressed satisfaction with the supervisor and reported that the supervisor assisted them to solve problems and make decisions. One subject who holds a low professional-high bureaucratic orientation reported that the supervisor interfered with his work and personal life. This information was not followed up with detailed probe questions.

In brief, these cases suggest that the effects of types of approaches may differ in relation to contingencies associated with age, sex, and professional training.

B29895